REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 034 24
POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN TEACHER ROLE. VOLUME 3--STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER.
BY- BIDDLE, BRUCE J. RANKIN, EARL F., JR.
MISSOURI UNIV., COLUMBIA
REPORT NUMBER CRP-1081-VOL. 3 PUB DATE JUN 61
MISSOURI UNIV., KANSAS CITY
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.36 HC-$8.00 200P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER ROLE, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, TEACHER RECRUITMENT, *ROLE CONFLICTS, TEACHERS, PARENTS, SCHOOL PERSONNEL, COLLEGE STUDENTS, *ROLE THEORY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI, KANSAS CITY

THE HYPOTHESIS THAT TEACHERS, PARENTS, PUPILS, AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS VIEW TEACHER ROLES DIFFERENTLY WAS TESTED. NINETEEN CONCEPTUAL DISTINCTIONS USED IN THE STUDY WERE DEFINED. THE DATA ANALYZED CAME FROM EARLIER ROLE STUDIES SUPPLEMENTED WITH ADDITIONAL DATA ACQUIRED FOR THIS STUDY. FINDINGS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA WERE REPORTED AND DISCUSSED. POSITION NORMS FOR TEACHERS AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS WERE AT VARIANCE WITH PUPIL NORMS. PARENT NORMS FELL BETWEEN NORMS HELD BY PUPILS AND THOSE HELD BY TEACHERS AND SCHOOL OFFICIALS. THE FINDINGS WERE INTERPRETED AS SUGGESTING THAT ROLE CONFLICTS AMONG THE GROUPS INTERFERE WITH ATTAINMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES. SUBSEQUENT STUDY AND PROCEDURAL DESCRIPTIONS APPEAR IN ED 002 851, ED 003 035, AND ED 002 986. (WN)

ED003034

[illegible]
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

CRP No. 1082
Vol. 1,2,3,4,5,6.

REFERENCE
COPY

COOPERATIVE
RESEARCH
PROJECT

No. 1082-3

ositional Differences in Teacher Role

by

BRUCE J. BIDDLE
Project Director

HOWARD A. ROSENCRANZ
Research Associate

and

EARL F. RANKIN, JR.
Research Associate

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Volume 3 - Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher

Social Psychology Laboratory
The University of Missouri
Columbia
June, 1961

Conducted under Contracts with the Cooperative Research Program
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
at
The University of Kansas City and the University of Missouri

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN TEACHER ROLE

by

Bruce J. Biddle
Project Director

Howard A. Rosencranz
Research Associate

and

Earl F. Rankin, Jr.
Research Associate

Volume 3 - STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

Social Psychology Laboratory
The University of Missouri
Columbia
June, 1961

Conducted under Contracts with the Cooperative Research Program
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

at

The University of Kansas City and The University of Missouri

Acknowledgements

Many other persons in addition to the authors have helped in the project partially reported here. Although not in any way responsible for the findings or their interpretation, thanks are due to Egon Guba and Neal Gross for assistance during the planning phase. William Bennett, Jr., Virginia Calkins, Sandie Eveloff, Harriett Guthrie, Daniel Hays, Roger Miller, Marjorie Ryckman, Ealeen Sentner, Jack Siegler, Edward Tomich, J. Paschal Twyman, and F. Neal Willis served as Graduate Assistants at one time or another. A group of graduate students at The University of Kansas City have served as interviewers and interviewing assistants; while others, particularly Ellen H. Biddle, have held responsibilities for coding. Our thanks should also go to the many public school educators in the Kansas City metropolitan area for their cooperation and assistance in making the project possible; while inestimable help was provided throughout the first two project years by Dean Hugh W. Speer and the faculty of the School of Education, University of Kansas City. We are also indebted to Gloria Cross, Thalia Dooley , Janet Wall, and Sharon Christopher for typing the manuscript.

Initial distribution of this report has been made to the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and copies of it may be obtained on loan from depository libraries of the program.

Additional copies may be purchased from the University of Missouri Press, Building T-2, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

FOREWORD

In July 1958, a program of research on the role of the public school teacher was inaugurated at The University of Kansas City. This program has had three broad objectives:

1. To pursue role theory and aid in its development as a sophisticated system of analysis in social psychology.
2. To study extensively and empirically the role of the public school teacher.
3. To explore the relationships between teacher role and the problems of teacher recruitment.

These objectives have required a variety of activities. To date, staff members have engaged in: (a) The development of a consistent set of terms and distinctions applicable to role theory; (b) The systematic review of the published literature on role theory and on empirical studies of educational roles; (c) The development of a methodology applicable to the study of roles; and (d) The collection of interview data from respondents in the Kansas City metropolitan area in three field studies covering aspects of the role of the public school teacher.

In part, this research program has been supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through two research contracts, one granted to the University of Kansas City and one granted to the University of Missouri to which the project moved in September 1960. Additional support of the program is now being provided by the Office of Naval Research (Group Psychology Branch).

This volume is one of several which are submitted to the Cooperative Research Program as a Final Report. It is concerned with an examination of differences in teacher roles held by four groups of respondents, teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials. Each chapter of the volume compares these four groups in terms of some aspect ofteacher role as measured by a different instrument or analysis technique. We are able to show significant and systematic differences between the roles held by these groups. These findings are then interpreted for both role theory and the role of the public school teacher.

Other Final Report volumes are also available from this research program. These are organized into two series. The numerical series deals with findings from our empirical investigations of teacher role in Kansas City. The alphabetic series is concerned with role theory, methods and bibliographic reviews. A general outline of reports, either already available or in preparation, is provided in Figure i.i on the following page.

Some materials within this volume will assume a prior acquaintance with Volume 1 - Orientation, Methods and Materials (see Figure i.i). Whereas the casual reader will find that this volume may be read for findings and interpretation, the serious reader who is concerned with methods, assumptions and samples is urged to acquire a prior familiarization with Volume 1. Or better yet, to keep it handy while reading this volume.

Bruce J. Biddle
Howard A. Rosencranz
Earl F. Rankin, Jr.
January, 1962

GENERAL OUTLINE - STUDIES IN THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER

Series I - THEORETICAL, METHODOLOGICAL AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC STUDIES

A - Role Theory and the Methods of Role Analysis

B - Bibliographies on Role Terms, Role Conflict, and the Role of the Teacher

C - A Program for the Processing of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected Central Tendency Differences

D - Bibliographies on Role Methodology and Propositions

Series II - EMPIRICAL REPORTS

1 - Orientation, Methods and Materials

2 - General Characteristics of the School Teacher's Role

3 - Positional Differences in Teacher Role

4 - Role of the Teacher and Occupational Choice

5 - Own and Attributed Cognitions for the Teacher*

6 - Type of Community and Role of the Teacher

Figure i.1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword i

Table of Contents iv

List of Tables and Figures vii

Chapter I -INTRODUCTION

The Problem 1

Conceptual Distinctions 2
Expectations and Norms 2
Characteristics of Teachers 2
Background 4
Frameworks 5
Levels of Cognitions 5
Role Conflict 6
Respondent Position 7

Sources of Data 7

Methods of Analysis 8

Limitations of the Data and Findings 8

Chapter II - COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER ENTRANCE INTO SETTINGS

Introduction 11

Findings for Comparisons of Positions 21

Conclusion 22

Chapter III - VOLUNTEERED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER TRAITS

Introduction 23

Tables of Results and Findings Based on Percentage of Usage 24

Summary of Findings Based on Percentage of Usage 37

Tables of Results Based on Scaled Points 45

Summary of Findings Based on Scaled Points 51

Conclusion 57

Findings for Scale Point Analysis 59

Chapter IV - VOLUNTEERED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS

Introduction 61

Page

Tables of Results and Findings 65

Summary 81

Chapter V - POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN SCALED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIOR

Introduction 83

Tables of Results and Findings..85

Summary..102

Chapter VI - POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN ACCURACY

Introduction..103

Results 105

Summary of Results 114
    Teachers as Subjects 114
    Parents as Respondents 114
    Pupils as Respondents 114
    School Officials as Respondents...114

Commentary 115

Chapter VII - POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN VERIDICALITY

Introduction...117

Results 119

Summary and Commentary...133
    Own and Attributed Cognitions 133
    Sentient Object Positions 133
    Respondent Positions...134

Chapter VIII - RESULTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Introduction 135

Findings for Role Theory...135
    Teacher Entrance into Settings...135
    Content Frameworks Used in Teacher Role....................................136
    Scaling of Volunteered Data...137
    Traits and Behaviors..139
    Positional Differences for Scaled Data 140
    Positional Differences in Accuracy..141
    Positional Differences in Veridicality...142
    The Comparative Status of Errors...143

Findings for Teacher Role 145
    Positional Differences 145
    Pluralistic Ignorance in Teacher Role..147

Page

Appendix A - TRAITS OF TEACHERS VOLUNTEERED BY RESPONDENTS

A_1 - Traits Volunteered For Positive Norm Usage 155

A_2 - Traits Volunteered for Negative Norm Usage 157

A_3 - Traits Volunteered for Expectations Usage 159

Appendix B - UNIQUE BEHAVIORS VOLUNTEERED BY RESPONDENTS

B_1 - Unique Behaviors Volunteered for Positive Norm Usage................ 163

B_2 - Unique Behaviors Volunteered for Negative Norm Usage 167

B_3 - Unique Behaviors Volunteered for Expectation Usage 171

B_4 - Unique Behaviors Volunteered for Combined Usage 175

Appendix C - SCALED COGNITIONS AND REPORTED TEACHER BEHAVIORS

C_1 - Items Used for Scaled Cognition Questions 181

C_2 - Scaled Cognitions and Behaviors Reported By Teachers 182

C_3 - Scaled Cognitions Reported by Parents 183

C_4 - Scaled Cognitions Reported by Pupils 184

C_5 - Scaled Cognitions Reported by School Officials 185

References 187

List of Tables and Figures

Number	Title	Page
2.1	Mean Norms and Expectations for Teacher Entrance Into Settings Arranged by Mean Own Norm and Expectations Held by Teachers	12
2.2	Norms for Entrance Into Janitor's Room	17
2.3	Significant Differences Among Positions For School Settings By Position, Significance of Difference and Significance Level	18
3.1	Positional Differences In Content Area Usage for "Teacher Professionalism and Discipline"	26
3.2	Positional Differences In Content Area Usage for "Job-Related Teacher Characteristics"	28
3.3	Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Ability and Interest"	30
3.4	Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Rapport and Orderliness"	32
3.5	Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Teacher Ethics"	33
3.6	Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Reasonableness of Teacher Behavior"	33
3.7	Positional Differences in Content Area Usage for "Emotional Support of Pupils"	34
3.8	Content Areas Involved Uniquely in Positional Cognitive Disparities	56
3.9	Content Areas Common to Teachers, Parents and Pupils for Intra-Positional Disparities	58
4.1	Number of Significant Differences of Proportion of Usage for Unique Items by Position and Cognition Type	64
4.2	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition Type for Items Concerned with Teachers' Controlling Pupils	66
4.3	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition Type for Items Concerned with Participation and Stressing Health	68
4.4	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition Type for Items Concerned with Participation and Stressing Health	70
4.5	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition Type for Items Concerned with Pattern Maintenance	72
4.6	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition Type for Items Concerned with Teacher Features, Manners and Imputed Cognitive Structure	74
4.7	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition Type for Items Concerned with Teachers' Social Behavior	76
4.8	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition Type for Items concerned with Teachers' Task Performance	78
4.9	Significant Positional Disparities by Cognition for Miscellaneous Items	80
51.	Number of Significant, Own and Attributed Positional Cognitive Disparities for Scaled Teacher Behaviors	84
5.2	Scaled Positional Differences for Maintenance of Order	88
5.3	Scaled Positional Differences for Control of Deviancy	90
5.4	Scaled Positional Differences for Teacher Self Indulgence	94
5.5	Scaled Positional Differences for Community Participation	96
5.6	Scaled Positional Differences for Teacher Cooperation	98
5.7	Scaled Positional Differences for Miscellaneous Items	99
6.1	Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions	104
6.2	Significant Mean Differences Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Teacher Self Indulgence	106

Number	Title	Page
6.3	Significant Mean Differences for the Maintenance of Order	108
6.4	Significant Mean Differences for Threatening Pupils	109
6.6	Significant Mean Differences for Making Pupils Sing	112
6.7	Significant Mean Differences for Cooperation and Participation	112
6.8	Significant Mean Differences for Studying and Grading	113
7.1a	Number of Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior	118 118
7.1b	Totals by Type of Cognition	118
7.1c	Totals by Sentient Object Position	118
7.2	Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Maintenance Functions	122
7.3	Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Teacher Pupil Relations	125
7.4	Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Deviancy Control	127
7.5	Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Self Indulgence	129
7.6	Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Community and PTA Participation	130
7.7	Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Non-Veridical Items	131
8.1	Numbers and Percentages of Significant Disparities Between Positions (Among Available Items) for Volunteered Behaviors and Traits	138
8.2	Numbers and Percentages of Significant Disparities Between Positions (Among Available Items) for Accuracy, Veridicality and Positional Differences	144

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The role of the public school teacher may be defined as a set of related cognitions maintained for that position by teachers themselves and related others. The purpose of this volume is that of discovering areas of similarity and disparity of cognitions held by teachers and members of other positions for the role of the teacher.

Educators and others have often assumed that the teacher role consists of a consensual configuration of cognitive elements. In other words, it is assumed that all people see the teacher position in the same way regardless of positional affiliation.

If this were the case then any problem encountered by the teacher in the fulfillment of role requirements would be the result of personal inability to meet these requirements. Conflicts could not arise due to the influence of incompartible expectations and values held by various persons. Any problem of adjustment the teacher might have could legitimately be attributed to the individual teacher because everyone else would know both what was expected and what should be done.

However, if consensus is not the case and there is a significant amount of cognitive disparities between and within positions related to the teacher role, the implications are very different. The problems encountered by the teacher might very well be the result of converging incompatible cognitions in areas crucial to the teacher role. That there are several positions having a significant relationship to the teacher position is indisputable. Teachers interact with pupils, parents, school officials, and the public at large pays the bills of educational systems. In addition, the members of different social positions are the recipients of differential socialization. It would be very surprising if all members of every position held the same values and expectations for the teacher role. Even if they did display absolute consensus of content, would the various positions be influecned to the same degree? For example, would all persons expect the teachers to behave very firmly in the classroom or is it not likely that some would expect, like, or dislike very firm, moderately firm or even lenient behavior?

The basic hypothesis of this volume is that there are significant disparities in teacher role cognitions of many types between and within positions. It is also assumed that these disparities create problems for the teacher and have significant implications for education per se.

Three empirical field studies were conducted in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area in which various aspects of teacher role were studied. This volume is one of a series that utilizes data gathered in these studies and attempts to cope specifically with the problems stated above.

Conceptual Distictions

A brief summary of distinctions used in the study of the public school teacher role is given for the casual reader. The more serious student is referred to Volume A 1/ of the series for an extended discussion of these concepts.

Expectations and Norms. An expectation is a belief concerning the characteristics most likely to be manifested by a person or a position (a group of persons). For example, one might believe teachers behave appropriately or few or many teachers are kind or considerate. Expectations give no information relevant to the values people hold for reported characteristics. Expectations may not provide information relevant to actual behaviors unless it is assumed the reported expectation is veridical.

A norm is a value oriented cognition about the characteristics of a person or position. One might feel that teachers should be firm or behave appropriately. Norms may be positive or negative. The example above is illustrative of a positive norm while the expression, "teachers should not discipline too harshly" is an example of a negative norm. Norms do not provide information about the beliefs people hold nor do they, any more than expectations, tell us about actual teacher characteristics.

The study of expectations should provide information about the stereotypes which people hold about teachers, and we may assume that in the absence of direct perceptual information, people are more or less forced to behave toward others in terms of their beliefs about the world. The study of norms should provide information relevant to the standards people hold for teachers and about issues of morality considered relevant or important for the teacher position. It is assumed that norms (both positive and negative) and expectationss are basic aspects or components of the teacher role **held** both by teachers themselves and by members of other positions connected with the educational system.

Characteristics of Teachers. Several characteristics or aspects of teachers may be distinguished about which cognitions may be held. Behaviors, features, traits, imputed cognitive structures, historical events, and presence in backgrounds are treated here as distinct characteristics. Behaviors refers to any overt action being carried out by a teacher. Behaviors are transitory, volitional, molar, and may or may not be directed toward others in the immediate vicinity. A behavior is always a description of what the teacher is doing and may vary in molarity from a broad inclusive behavior such as "teaching" to a specific behavior such as "reading a book". Behaviors change rapidly from situation to situation, and it is safe to assume the teacher will not only behave differently as situations change but that cognitions held for teachers will also reflect the influence of changing situations.

Cognitions may also be held for teacher characteristics that are relatively permanent, non-volitional, and non-directed. People have no control over such things as age, sex, and skin color, but cognitions may still be held concerning such characteristics. Such aspects of persons are termed features, and together with behaviors are assumed to constitute the role of the teacher on the overt level.

Additional distinctions pertaining to teacher characteristics should be made for cognitions held about teachers. Although it is easy to demonstrate radical changes in behaviors as a person goes from one situation to another, certain behaviors are cognized by people as though they were independent of situations. For example, people refer to teachers as lazy, kind, or adequate. Such specifications are termed traits and may be defined as any cognitively identified aspect of a person or position which is presumed independent of situation or background. There are several types of traits. Features may be treated as traits as are frozen patterns of behaviors such as "teachers talk all the time." Attitudes, abilities, imputed cognitive structures and other abstractions which are treated by respondents as standing behind teacher behavior may be considered traits. Historical events such as country of birth or status in a school may be dealt with as traits.

Background The majority of cognitions held for teachers tend to locate the teacher in a background or situational context. Barker and Wright 2 /have shown that physical settings, social situations, position sets and purposes attract certain classes of people and also appear to generate patterns of behavior in those who enter them. Teachers are found in a variety of physical settings such as the playground, halls and athletic fields, and it can be assumed that behavior patterns will vary for the different settings. Social situations such as spelling lessons, music periods, or study hall may also be expected to generate characteristic patterns of behavior. Time of day, positional affiliation of persons present, serialized patterns of social interaction may also be expected to partially determine patterns of teacher behavior. It is safe to assume that background influences overt behaviors, and it may be assumed that some cognitions held about characteristics and behaviors of teachers also depend upon background specification. This volume attempts to make a systematic beginning toward dealing with the relationships between position, background, and role cognitions.

Frameworks The term frameworks define a scaled content area which is used by an observer or participant to judge the characteristics of another. When content areas are selected by observers to describe a position, it can be assumed such content is a salient aspect of the observer's cognitive structure. When many observers report usage of the same frameworks, such content should be given careful consideration. As used here, frameworks are assumed to consist of a scale of matually exclusive points into which characteristics of the teacher may be mapped. It is possible to assign scale point values to any frameworks that are used, thereby making it possible to quantitatively compare frameworks in terms of degree and directionality.

Levels of Cognitions. Own cognitions are simply those cognitive elements reported by observers and attributed to themselves. Attributed cognitions are role elements held by observers for others. For example, the statement, "Superintendants expect too much from teachers", is an attributed expectation by an observer for the position of superintendant. Own and attributed cognitions may not coincide and in fact are often independent. Areas of disparity between own and attributed cognitions provide valuable information relevant to positional difference, cognitive dissonance, ignorance, stereotypes, etc.

Role Conflict. Two or more cognitions are said to provide potential for conflict if they are incompatible and applied to the same object. Cognitive disparities from any two positions related to the teacher, focusing upon the teacher position could create problems for the teacher. For example, if parents expect teachers to maintain a high degree of order in the classroom and school officials expect the teachers to ignore maintenance of order there is a potential source of trouble for the teacher. If the teachers dislike the things that pupils like there is again the possibility of conflict for the teacher. Cognitive disparities of several types may exist within positions and between positions. Expectations vs expectation, negative norm vs negative norm, positive norm vs positive norm, and any combination of the above are possible (and actual) types of disparities which may lead to role conflict.

There are two additional concepts which are used in this volume that are closely associated with role conflict and positional disparities. Accuracy refers to similarity of attributed cognitions and cognitions held by others. Accuracy can be defined as the degree of similarity of role cognitions attributed to members of other positions and the actual role cognitions which are held by the members of other positions. Accuracy of cognitions could conceivably range on continuum from no accuracy to completely correct attribution of cognition. The latter is highly unlikely. Verdicality may be defined as the degree to which the member of a position holding role cognitions correctly maps the actual behaviors of the members of that position. Teachers hold role cognitions for the teacher position, and again it is possible that such cognitions may be non-veridical or very correct. This is also the case for all respondents holding positional affiliation.

Respondent Position. Every person belongs to some social position. Parents, pupils, school officials, students may be assumed to be members of distinct positions bearing functional relationship with the teacher position. We may expect to find (and do) significant differences in cognitions (own and attributed) held for teachers by each respondent position. It would be surprising if this were not the case considering that members of various positions are subjected to unique experiences and respond to differentiated social requirements.

Sources of Data

Although three independent studies have been conducted in the authors' research on student role, only two of these provided data which are analyzed in this volume. In the Background Study problems of context for teacher role were dealt with systematically. Community and school settings were explored, social situations in school settings were studied, purposes of teacher actions in community settings were obtained from respondents. This study involved the administration of a questionnaire to approximately 225 respondents representing eight differentiated positions connected with the public school. The Background Study enabled the isolation of a series of contexts for teacher behavior which were later used to separate differentiated teacher role cognitions from similar respondents. In the Role Study attempts were made (1) to identify the content frameworks representing teacher characteristics which were used by respondents in dealing with teacher role and (2) to study the own and attributed cognitions held by respondents for teachers relative to the given frameworks. 927 respondents from seven community positions and three college student positions answered questionnaires in the Role Study. Data were gathered concerning teacher behaviors, teacher traits, teacher problems, and motivations regarding the teaching profession. A limited attempt was made to gather data relative to actual teacher behaviors by asking teachers to indicate their own behavior in comparison with norms and expectations.

This volume reports data relevant to cognitions for teacher entrance into settings, volunteered cognitions for teacher traits and volunteered cognitions for teacher behaviors. Primary emphasis is placed on the relationship between reported behaviors and traits for the teacher and backgrounds.

Methods of Analysis

Special methods of analysis peculiar to any chapter in this volume are discussed in the appropriate chapter. In general, however, cognitions held by community positions are compared in terms of scaled data utilizing the Mann Whitney z_U as a test of significant differences. When making comparisons of usage of content frameworks, t tests are utilized to measure significance of difference. (See Volume C 3/ of this series for a complete discussion of the Mann Whitney z_U) Due to the large volume of data processed for this volume, all computations were done by tabulating machines and a digital computer.

Limitations of the Data and Findings

Any study or research project seeks, ideally, the objective of providing complete explanation and total coverage of the areas being studied. That this is seldom achieved is easily demonstrated particularly in the behavioral sciences. This study, like others, suffers from limitations and assumptions that require specification.

1. It is assumed here that role cognitions are held by individuals and not in consensus (actual or assumed) by a group. Therefore, individuals

have been asked to report their values and expectations for themselves, not for what the group wanted or expected. This procedure maximizes the probability of finding cognitive disparities.

2. It is assumed that role is cognitive rather than a behavioral phenomenon.

3. The universe of respondents who might hold cognitions for teachers or exert influence on the teaching position was not exhausted by the sample. No doubt more than the positions included in this sample are significantly related to the teacher position.

4. The choice of five point scale is arbitrary and may possibily be too crude.

5. With the exception of a single question given only to teachers (Form C_5 - Volume 1 4/) actual behaviors of teachers were ignored.

6. Concentration has been primarily on the teacher role in school settings. There must be additional non-school settings for which teacher role cognitions are held.

7. Many social and physical conditions of the teacher environment have been neglected.

8. The sample was limited to a midwestern metropolitan area, and it is not known to what degree this area is representative of the entire country.

9. The sample is underrepresentative of certain groups such as ethnic minorities and lower socio-economic classes.

Due to the limitations stated above, the reader is cautioned to avoid overgeneralization. However, such a caution should not preclude reasonable speculation as to the significance of findings reported here.

ECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

CHAPTER II

COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER ENTRANCE INTO SETTINGS

Introduction

Form B_2 of the background study was designed for the purpose of gaining information relevant to norms and expectations for teacher entrance into settings. Respondents from the positions of teachers, parents, pupils, supervisors, former teachers, board members, principals and superintendents were asked to give their expectations for, and indicate their approval or disapproval of teachers in 114 specified settings or contexts. For expectations, subjects sorted 114 cards (each of which specified a setting) into five piles. Pile number one corresponded to the respondent expecting to see the teacher in the setting very seldom or not at all. Pile five corresponded to the respondent expecting the teacher to be found in the setting a great deal of the time. For the measurement of norms the subjects again sorted the 114 settings into five piles in which pile one corresponded to the subject expressing strong disapproval for teacher entrance and pile five which indicated strong approval by the subject for teacher entrance into the setting. Therefore, for both norms and expectations, responses were given on a five point continuum which provided a basis for the determination of mean norms and mean expectations for entrance into settings.

Statistical analysis of these data makes it possible to determine both positional similarities and disparities of cognitions held for teacher entrance into setting. Ranking the means of the settings by position for expectations and norms shows those items which respondents most approved of as opposed to least approved items plus indicating contexts where expectancy for teacher entrance ranges from high expectancy to low. Table 2.1 contains mean expectations and norms for 114 contexts arranged by mean own norms and expectations held by teachers.

Table 2.1

MEAN NORMS AND EXPECTATIONS FOR TEACHER ENTRANCE INTO SETTINGS ARRANGED BY MEAN OWN NORM AND EXPECTATION HELD BY TEACHERS

Setting	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	Supervisors	Former Teachers	Board Members	Principals	Superintendents
	Mean Norms							
Liquor/Drug Addiction Clinic	1.57	1.50	1.46	1.82	2.15	1.31	1.59	1.78
Liquor Stores	1.72	1.41	1.17	2.18	2.54	1.67	1.78	1.93
Gambling Establishment	1.73	1.34	1.34	1.45	2.31	1.11	1.44	1.57
Prisons	1.73	1.86	1.54	1.82	2.69	2.22	2.18	2.14
Taverns	1.83	1.45	1.32	1.36	2.15	1.28	1.15	1.71
Burlesque Shows	1.87	1.54	1.34	1.91	2.08	1.67	1.92	2.00
Beer Supply Co.	1.91	1.20	1.24	1.00	1.23	1.00	1.14	1.00
Billiard Parlors	2.00	1.75	1.93	1.82	2.08	1.58	2.15	2.07
Fortune Teller's Hall	2.06	1.64	1.66	2.18	2.31	1.39	2.07	1.86
Public School Cloak Room	2.11	3.72	3.27	4.00	4.46	4.00	3.96	3.93
Police Station	2.19	2.00	1.93	2.00	2.92	1.89	2.41	2.57
Police Patrol Car	2.21	1.66	1.63	1.91	2.68	1.78	2.46	2.21
Night Clubs	2.32	1.75	1.71	2.36	2.69	2.10	2.53	2.86
City Dumps	2.43	1.77	1.56	1.73	2.83	2.16	2.22	2.50
Book Stores	2.47	4.36	3.78	4.36	4.77	4.26	4.43	4.43
State Patrol Office	2.53	2.45	1.73	2.27	2.31	2.11	2.82	2.93
Horse Race Tracks	2.54	1.91	2.07	2.64	2.54	2.00	2.26	2.50
Slums	2.57	2.36	1.39	2.09	3.69	1.89	2.69	2.71
Public School Boiler Rooms	2.68	2.48	2.51	2.27	3.46	2.00	2.11	2.78
Midget Auto Tracks	2.73	2.66	2.34	2.64	2.85	2.83	3.00	3.78
Public School Janitor's Room	2.77	2.20	2.32	2.45	3.46	2.55	2.82	3.00
Christian Sci. Reading Room	2.86	3.20	3.44	3.09	3.31	3.26	3.21	2.43
Marriage Counselor's Office	2.96	2.77	2.73	3.27	3.38	2.74	3.00	3.00
Physical Recreation Center	2.96	2.57	3.02	3.36	3.23	3.00	3.04	2.86
Political Org. Office	3.00	2.58	3.05	3.18	3.92	2.42	3.36	3.43
Auctions	3.11	3.02	3.02	3.18	3.38	3.16	3.14	3.21
Airline Hostess School	3.18	2.89	2.77	3.27	3.23	2.72	3.41	2.93
Settlement House	3.19	3.00	2.85	3.64	3.61	3.10	3.46	3.71
Pub. Sch. Bldg. Fire Escape	3.21	3.68	2.85	3.00	4.38	3.73	3.68	3.21
City Plan. Commission	3.24	3.41	3.39	4.18	4.46	3.58	3.78	4.28
Catholic Church	3.28	3.41	2.93	3.45	3.69	3.31	3.78	3.28
Social Service Organization	3.34	3.66	3.60	4.36	4.23	3.68	3.89	3.86
Synagogue	3.34	3.43	2.85	3.36	3.61	3.05	3.57	3.36
Boys/Girls Parental School	3.36	4.04	3.43	3.09	4.23	3.84	3.48	3.50
Boys/Girls Detention Home	3.36	3.54	3.19	3.45	4.61	3.58	3.64	3.21
Vocational Rehabilitation Off.	3.40	3.61	3.68	3.09	4.08	3.42	3.63	3.43
Parochial School	3.45	3.29	2.83	3.27	3.92	3.28	3.10	3.36
Aviation School	3.47	3.09	3.05	3.00	3.85	2.95	3.41	3.29
Social Welfare Office	3.53	3.30	3.36	3.54	4.54	3.31	3.64	3.36
Military Academy	3.55	3.32	2.71	3.00	3.38	3.37	3.25	3.36

Table 2-11 (continued)

Setting	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	Supervisors	Former Teachers	Board Members	Principals	Superintendents
Railroad Station	3.60	3.20	2.97	3.54	4.23	3.26	3.48	3.28
Theological School	3.62	3.59	3.36	3.27	3.92	3.33	3.61	3.90
Human Relations Commission	3.64	3.27	3.49	3.72	4.00	3.21	3.53	3.64
Community Center	3.64	3.84	3.67	4.18	4.54	4.21	4.00	4.00
Teachers Agencies	3.70	3.34	3.54	3.00	3.85	3.42	3.61	3.00
Public School Locker Room	3.75	3.75	3.12	3.72	4.61	3.84	3.86	4.07
Public School Pools	3.77	3.73	3.02	3.91	4.85	3.89	3.85	4.00
Board of Education Office	3.81	4.27	3.93	3.18	4.31	4.00	3.93	4.21
Public School Lavatory	3.81	3.86	3.66	3.82	4.46	4.05	4.12	3.85
Religious Organization Office	3.85	3.84	3.68	3.45	3.77	3.58	3.57	3.93
Movie Theatre	3.85	3.43	3.05	4.00	4.15	3.53	3.92	3.71
Public School Teachers Lounge	3.85	3.86	3.41	3.72	4.46	3.84	4.11	4.00
Youth Bureau	3.86	3.84	3.36	3.64	4.54	3.74	4.00	4.07
Children's Orphan Home	3.87	4.18	3.89	3.54	4.23	4.09	3.81	3.64
Public School Shop	3.88	3.93	3.04	3.90	4.09	3.94	4.19	4.14
Public Recreation Center	3.90	3.84	3.44	3.66	4.54	3.95	4.00	4.21
Summer Camps	3.94	3.95	3.10	4.00	4.10	4.10	4.00	4.14
Public School Guidance Office	3.96	4.29	3.62	4.36	4.92	4.63	4.54	4.50
Superintendent of School Office	3.96	4.18	3.61	4.00	4.61	4.10	4.36	4.36
Public School Storerooms	3.96	3.34	3.05	4.00	4.31	3.26	3.96	3.71
Church Supply Company	3.96	3.36	3.39	3.27	3.77	3.58	3.61	3.43
Vocational Guidance	3.98	4.14	3.46	3.64	4.46	4.26	3.86	3.86
School Equipment & Supply Co.	4.00	3.86	3.46	4.09	4.23	3.84	4.26	4.15
Pre-schools	4.00	4.14	3.58	3.64	4.92	4.05	4.14	3.93
Public School Supply Rooms	4.01	3.68	3.46	4.09	4.23	3.73	4.07	3.92
Public Sch. Administration Off.	4.01	4.04	3.63	3.81	4.61	3.73	4.21	4.28
Public Sch. Medicine Office	4.02	3.98	3.49	3.91	4.46	4.26	4.18	3.93
Public Libraries	4.06	4.34	4.00	4.82	4.85	4.42	4.75	4.71
Speech Correction Clinic	4.07	3.84	3.44	4.00	4.61	4.21	4.32	3.93
Music Teacher's Studio	4.07	4.12	3.58	3.82	4.15	4.00	3.86	4.07
School for Mentally Retarded	4.08	4.25	3.56	3.82	4.69	4.21	4.21	3.93
Athletic Organization	4.11	3.61	3.39	3.82	4.69	4.16	4.14	4.21
Bible School	4.15	4.27	3.88	3.45	4.23	4.31	3.89	4.00
Public School Playgrounds	4.15	4.29	3.46	3.45	3.84	3.68	4.10	4.21
Junior Colleges	4.17	4.23	3.85	4.00	4.69	4.42	4.41	4.36
Beauty Parlors	4.19	3.93	3.12	4.54	3.92	4.00	4.21	4.00
Public School Athletic Field	4.21	4.36	3.40	4.00	4.92	4.68	4.42	4.42
Art or Drama School	4.21	4.14	3.15	3.45	3.54	4.05	4.12	4.29
School for Handicapped Children	4.23	4.23	3.83	3.73	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.43
Language Institute	4.23	4.32	3.71	4.54	4.77	4.53	4.07	4.21
Legitimate Theatre	4.23	3.54	2.56	4.27	4.31	3.79	4.46	4.43
Evening School	4.24	4.32	4.02	4.18	4.54	4.47	4.55	4.64
Civic Organizations	4.25	3.82	3.56	4.73	4.61	3.99	4.25	4.57

Table 2.1 (continued)

Setting	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	Supervisors	Former Teachers	Board Members	Principals	Superintendents
Civic and Public Statues	4.26	3.73	3.54	4.59	4.31	4.21	4.39	4.43
Public Gardens and Parks	4.26	3.73	3.94	4.36	4.23	4.10	4.28	4.00
Public School Grounds/Walks	4.28	4.47	3.58	4.27	4.69	4.63	4.39	3.85
Public School Gymnasium	4.30	4.25	3.39	5.09	5.00	4.68	4.39	4.50
Public School Halls	4.32	4.16	3.83	4.27	4.69	4.53	4.48	4.57
Public School Cafeteria	4.33	4.31	4.00	4.63	4.92	4.73	4.48	4.64
Public School Laboratories	4.45	4.41	3.85	4.45	4.92	4.74	3.61	4.43
Research Institute Lab.	4.47	4.18	3.66	4.09	4.16	4.16	4.52	4.43
Public School Auditorium	4.52	4.65	3.82	4.70	3.92	4.78	4.66	4.64
Protestant Churches	4.53	4.58	3.70	4.36	4.38	4.77	4.96	4.50
Public School Playgrounds	4.53	4.77	4.07	4.72	4.92	4.84	4.75	3.71
Public Art Galleries	4.60	4.20	3.76	4.82	4.61	4.10	4.55	4.43
Teacher's own home	4.68	4.64	4.80	4.45	4.61	4.63	4.69	4.64
Summer School Classes	4.70	4.68	4.02	4.54	4.92	4.58	4.78	4.86
Public Museums	4.72	4.19	3.83	4.73	4.70	4.42	4.39	4.21
Public School Library	4.83	4.70	4.17	4.72	4.92	4.79	4.71	4.71
Teachers' Colleges	4.85	4.84	4.34	4.36	5.00	4.84	4.78	4.71
Public School Classrooms	4.86	4.86	4.75	5.00	5.00	4.84	4.92	4.85
Colleges	4.88	4.64	4.24	4.91	5.00	4.34	4.93	4.86
University	4.90	3.16	4.17	5.00	5.00	4.89	4.89	4.78
Mean Expectations								
School for Mentally Retarded	1.13	1.18	1.32	1.09	1.23	1.00	1.18	1.08
Settlement Houses	1.15	1.16	1.46	1.07	1.08	1.16	1.12	1.07
Slums	1.17	1.29	1.22	1.09	1.15	1.00	1.11	1.07
Prisons	1.18	1.18	1.43	1.45	1.08	1.53	1.28	1.14
Fortune Teller's Hall	1.19	1.18	1.27	1.09	1.15	1.05	1.11	1.07
Beer Supply Co.	1.21	1.20	1.24	1.00	1.23	1.00	1.14	1.01
Burlesque Show	1.28	1.25	1.34	1.09	1.15	1.10	1.32	1.14
City Dumps	1.24	1.11	1.24	1.00	1.31	1.05	1.14	1.28
Police Station	1.30	1.27	1.41	1.27	1.31	1.21	1.18	1.28
Taverns	1.34	1.29	1.29	1.09	1.23	1.21	1.32	1.21
Slums	1.40	1.32	1.29	1.27	1.23	1.21	1.32	1.21
Billiard Parlors	1.40	1.25	1.37	1.45	1.23	1.37	1.35	1.14
Liquor Store	1.41	1.36	1.27	1.09	1.31	1.56	1.28	1.14
State Patrol Office	1.47	1.52	1.63	1.18	1.31	1.10	1.55	1.57
Psy. Receiving Center	1.50	1.54	2.14	1.36	1.54	1.58	1.48	1.36
P.S. Bldg. Fire Escape	1.56	2.31	2.17	1.54	2.00	2.52	1.75	1.78
Marriage Counsel Office	1.57	1.59	1.81	1.54	1.38	1.68	1.59	1.57
P. S. Janitors	1.60	1.70	1.73	1.36	1.77	1.68	1.85	1.78
P. S. Boiler Room	1.61	1.54	1.85	1.45	1.53	1.42	1.78	1.85
Horse Race Track	1.72	1.27	1.29	1.45	1.46	1.26	1.50	1.71

Table 2.1 (continued)

Setting	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	Supervisors	Former Teachers	Board Members	Principals	Superintendents
Night Club	1.75	1.45	1.46	1.36	1.77	1.50	1.96	1.78
Midget Auto Tracks	1.79	1.89	1.51	1.18	1.46	1.47	1.82	2.14
Vocational Rehabilitation Office	1.83	2.59	2.29	1.72	2.31	2.10	1.93	2.07
Airlines School Exchange	1.87	1.89	1.89	1.27	2.15	1.84	1.79	1.92
Boys/Girls Det. Home	1.89	2.04	2.17	1.64	2.00	1.74	1.85	1.87
Christian Science Reading Room	1.90	2.11	3.02	1.91	1.69	1.63	2.11	2.00
Auctions	1.91	2.00	2.07	1.64	2.08	2.16	2.18	2.57
City Planning Counsel	1.98	1.93	2.63	1.73	1.85	1.89	2.00	2.36
Military Academy	1.98	2.35	2.02	1.64	2.00	2.05	2.26	2.33
Social Welfare Building	1.98	2.00	2.90	1.53	2.08	1.79	2.18	2.00
Political Organization Office	2.05	2.39	2.34	1.82	2.00	1.53	2.04	1.86
Aviation School	2.06	2.11	2.10	1.54	1.92	2.32	2.04	2.43
Children's Orphanage	2.09	2.50	2.41	1.82	2.08	2.31	2.11	1.86
Synagogue	2.11	3.16	3.49	2.36	2.92	2.84	3.33	3.21
Book Stores	2.11	2.50	2.32	2.09	2.23	1.74	2.32	2.37
Boys/Girls Private School	2.25	3.00	2.90	2.00	2.61	2.63	2.53	2.43
Parochial School	2.25	3.11	2.41	1.91	2.67	2.53	2.11	2.14
Church Supply Company	2.26	2.05	2.23	1.91	1.92	1.79	1.78	2.86
Theological School	2.34	2.89	2.56	1.36	2.38	2.21	2.00	2.00
Human Relations Committee	2.38	2.25	2.27	2.18	2.08	1.95	2.18	2.36
Teacher Agencies	2.43	2.32	3.36	2.45	2.69	2.31	2.68	2.78
Social Service Organizations	2.57	2.66	2.78	2.54	2.61	2.58	3.15	2.93
Public School Swimming Pool	2.58	2.77	2.21	2.27	3.61	3.10	2.25	3.25
Pre-Schools	2.62	3.22	3.00	2.09	3.00	3.00	2.48	2.93
Religious Organizations	2.66	2.75	2.95	2.27	2.54	2.37	2.14	3.07
Public School Lavatories	2.66	2.77	3.12	2.36	3.00	2.52	3.25	3.28
Public School Medical Office	2.69	2.79	3.00	2.00	2.76	2.68	2.96	2.64
Superintendent of Schools' Office	2.71	3.16	3.49	2.36	2.92	2.84	3.33	3.21
Railroad Station	2.70	2.29	1.93	2.91	2.54	2.31	2.73	2.86
School for Mentally Retarded	2.72	3.11	2.46	2.36	3.45	3.10	3.03	3.14
Young Peoples' Organization	2.75	3.48	2.73	3.27	3.38	3.68	3.18	3.36
Board of Education Office	2.77	3.07	3.03	2.18	2.15	2.47	3.32	2.79
Public School Locker Room	2.79	2.93	2.58	2.72	3.07	2.78	3.37	3.71
Public School Cloakroom	2.83	2.90	2.92	2.63	3.38	2.78	3.15	3.57
School Equipment and Supply Co.	2.83	2.68	2.88	2.54	2.54	2.26	3.11	3.21
Vocational Guidance Office	2.85	2.84	2.49	2.54	3.08	2.68	2.59	2.86
Speech Correction clinic	2.85	2.84	2.29	2.45	3.00	2.79	2.64	2.78
Research Pr.	2.86	2.93	2.93	2.54	3.45	2.74	2.78	3.86
Music Teacher Studio	2.90	3.27	3.07	2.18	2.77	3.31	2.89	3.28
School for Handicapped Children	2.90	3.04	2.93	2.62	2.85	3.68	3.21	2.78
Law Professor	2.92	3.50	2.93	2.45	2.92	3.42	2.85	3.36
Drama Show (or art)	2.98	3.14	3.39	2.53	3.23	3.10	2.59	3.07

Table 2.1 (Continued)

Setting	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	Supervisors	Former Teachers	Board Members	Principals	Superintendents
Summer Camps	3.02	2.76	2.39	2.73	2.92	3.26	3.22	3.36
Public School Teachers Lounge	3.03	2.84	3.39	3.09	3.00	3.36	3.67	3.57
Junior Colleges	3.06	3.27	2.97	3.00	3.38	3.17	3.11	3.00
Catholic Church	3.07	2.93	2.44	2.91	5.38	5.42	2.86	2.64
Public School Storerooms	3.09	2.54	2.76	2.64	2.92	2.68	3.10	3.07
Athletic Organizations	3.11	3.02	2.98	3.00	3.46	3.26	3.29	3.67
Civic Landmarks & Statues	3.13	2.91	2.73	3.36	2.92	3.10	3.22	3.43
Community Centers	3.13	3.29	3.07	3.27	3.23	3.26	3.00	3.21
Public School Shop	3.16	2.95	2.97	3.18	3.46	2.78	3.11	3.64
Movie Theatres	3.17	2.82	2.46	3.09	3.23	2.74	3.30	3.28
Bible School	3.17	3.41	3.17	2.64	2.94	3.05	2.82	2.24
Public School Supply Rooms	3.22	3.06	3.00	2.90	3.00	2.84	3.39	3.57
Public Museums	3.30	2.98	3.27	3.64	2.85	3.42	3.46	3.57
Legitimate Theatre	3.32	2.77	2.10	3.64	3.38	3.00	3.59	2.93
Public School Guidance Office	3.32	3.34	3.24	3.00	3.92	3.42	3.48	3.71
Public School Add. Office	3.36	3.52	3.34	2.81	3.76	3.26	3.97	3.35
Public Gardens & Parks	3.36	3.04	3.00	3.82	2.92	3.06	3.46	3.43
Athletic Fields	3.38	3.35	3.04	3.54	4.00	3.68	3.92	4.21
Public Recreation Centers	3.38	3.82	3.97	3.86	3.87	3.62	4.00	3.25
Civic Organizations	3.41	3.29	2.85	3.73	3.09	3.26	3.44	3.57
Beauty Parlors	3.41	3.32	2.76	3.64	2.92	3.16	3.43	3.64
Public School Labs	3.44	3.50	3.26	3.45	4.07	3.63	4.00	3.92
Public Art Galleries	3.46	3.22	3.24	3.54	2.77	3.53	3.48	3.43
Public School Grounds & Walks	3.71	3.25	3.30	3.36	3.53	3.42	3.85	4.00
Public School Cafeteria	3.72	3.52	3.60	3.72	4.00	4.15	4.32	4.35
Public School Gym	3.73	3.65	3.41	3.64	4.30	3.36	3.57	4.00
Public School Auditorium	3.88	3.68	3.41	3.72	4.15	3.57	3.96	4.28
Public School Halls	3.94	3.47	3.87	4.36	3.92	3.73	3.32	4.21
Bookstore exchange	3.96	3.61	3.24	3.64	3.23	3.37	3.78	3.86
Evening College	4.06	3.61	3.51	3.18	4.23	3.58	4.98	4.21
Public Libraries	4.11	3.93	3.56	4.00	4.00	3.58	4.00	4.14
Protestant Churches	4.15	3.95	3.46	4.09	4.08	4.26	4.26	4.07
Public School Playgrounds	4.20	3.97	3.58	4.09	4.15	4.42	4.42	4.28
Teacher's own home	4.30	4.18	4.51	3.18	4.46	3.79	4.14	4.21
Public School Library	4.32	3.95	3.97	3.90	4.38	4.00	4.53	4.35
Universities	4.33	3.86	3.68	4.27	4.46	4.10	4.43	4.43
Summer School Classes	4.49	4.09	3.61	4.46	4.69	4.35	4.68	4.43
College	4.53	4.16	3.80	4.45	4.64	4.26	4.67	4.64
Teacher's own College	4.62	4.04	3.93	4.27	4.61	4.10	4.64	4.67
Public School Classroom	4.88	4.90	4.78	5.00	4.84	5.00	4.82	4.71

Because a computer was not available for making comparisons for positional differences only a limited set of comparisons were made. Twenty-five of the contexts were school settings. For these 25 settings the positions of parents, pupils, and school personal (which included all other respondents) were compared. The original 5 point scales were broken at the grand response median and a three by two contingency table was prepared which allowed for chi-square computations for significance of difference for both norms and expectations. An example of such a table and computation is given below in Figure 2.2.

	Scaled Responses		
	1 and 2	3, 4, and 5	Totals
School Personnel	48	89	137
Parents	22	22	44
Pupils	22	19	41
TOTALS	92	130	222

$X^2 = 6.19$ $p < .05$ (DF = 2)

Fig. 2.2--NORMS FOR ENTRANCE INTO JANITOR'S ROOM

It will be noted in Figure 2.2 that whereas parents and pupils are evenly divided on whether teachers should or should not enter the janitor's room (as measured by cutting between scale points 2 on 3) that school personnel are more in favor of such entrance. Thus, the significant X^2 value may be interpreted as measuring a difference between school personnel and the lumped parent-pupil group. Presenting all of the contingency tables is not practical but the summary of all X^2 computations is presented in Table 2.3. Both levels of significance and direction of differences are presented for norms and expectations for the twenty-five school settings in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG POSITIONS FOR SCHOOL SETTINGS BY POSITION, SIGN OF DIFFERENCE AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL

Setting	Chi-Square	P less than
(Settings where School Officials approve more teacher entrance)		
Public School Gym	23.57	.001
Public School Cafeteria	17.66	.001
Public School Storeroom	17.17	.001
Public School Halls	14.92	.001
Public School Janitor's Room	6.19	.05
(Settings where School Officials approve less teacher entrance)		
NONE		
(Settings where Parents approve more teacher entrance)		
Public School Building Fire Escape	14.47	.001
(Settings where Parents approve less teacher entrance)		
NONE		
(Settings where Pupils approve more teacher entrance)		
NONE		
(Settings where pupils approve less teacher entrance)		
Public School Auditorium	37.26	.001
Public School Playground	35.54	.001
Public School Swimming Pool	24.97	.001
Public School Building Stairs	24.86	.001
Public School Athletic Fields	24.26	.001
Public School Teachers Lounge	20.55	.001
Public School Library	20.32	.001
Public School Locker Room	18.43	.001
Public School Grounds and Walks	17.80	.001
Public School Shop	17.55	.001
Public School Guidance Office	14.74	.001
Public School Laboratory	14.55	.001
Public School Medical Office	11.70	.01
Public School Cloakroom	8.87	.02
Public School Administrative Office	8.73	.02
Public School Supply Room	7.97	.02

Table 2.3--Continued

Setting	Chi-Square	P less than
(Settings showing no significant differences)		
Public School Classroom		
Public School Lavatories		
Public School Boiler Room		
(Settings where School Officials expect more teacher entrance)		
Public School Athletic Fields	7.84	.02
(Settings where School Officials expect less teacher entrance)		
Public School Building Fire Escape	7.31	.05
(Settings where Parents expect more teacher entrance)		
NONE		
(Settings where Parents expect less teacher entrance)		
NONE		
(Settings where Pupils expect more teacher entrance)		
Public School Teachers' Lounge	7.26	.05
(Settings where Pupils expect less teacher entrance)		
Public School Swimming Pool	8.62	.02
Public School Playgrounds	7.74	.05
(Settings showing no significant differences)		
Public School Janitor's Room		
Public School Halls		
Public School Gym		
Public School Guidance Office		
Public School Grounds and Walks		
Public School Cloakroom		
Public School Medical Office		
Public School Locker Room		
Public School Library		

Table 2.3--Continued

Setting	Chi-Square	P less than
Public School Lavatories		
Public School Laboratories		
Public School Classroom		
Public School Cafeteria		
Public School Boiler Room		
Public School Auditorium		
Public School Administrative Office		
Public School Shop		
Public School Building Stairs		
Public School Storeroom		
Public School Supply Room		

Findings for Comparisons of Positions

2.31 Differences for norms were larger and more numerous. It appears that respondents differed more from one another over what they approved for teachers than over what teachers actually did. It is possible that this difference is artifactive (considering the methods of measurement), but the number and size of expectational differences barely exceeds chance variation.

2.32 Parents did not differ from the other two groups. In general, School Personnel were to be found in opposition to Pupils for most items. Parents tended to occupy an intermediary position.

2.33 School Personnel were more tolerant of teachers, Pupils less so. The intermediary position of Parents was upon a scale of general tolerance for teacher entrance into settings. In general, School Personnel wanted more teacher entrance, Pupils wanted less. These tendencies disappeared in the expectational data. Whether the intolerance of pupils reflects a lack of sophistication or a subsidiary position in the power hierarchy is yet to be determined.

2.34 Normative differences were weak or non-significant for settings where teachers are "bound" to be found (The Classroom), are not likely to be found (Janitor's Room, Supply Room, Boiler Room), or where normative preference is not applicable (Lavatories).

2.35 School Officials want more teacher entrance into settings where control of deviancy is a significant problem (Gym, Cafeteria, Halls), while Pupils want less teacher entrance into those settings involving teacher intrusion into pupil activities (Grounds and Walks, Athletic Fields, Playground, etc.) or teacher avoidance of responsibility (Teachers' Lounge, etc.)

2.36 Pupils expected teachers to avoid responsibility (by appearing in Teachers' Lounge and to be missing from Swimming Pool and Playground.)

School Officials expected teachers to spend more time on the Athletic Fields and less time on the Fire Escapes (?) than did other respondents.

The majority of the differences so far reviewed can be predicted from one of three possible theories: (a) Respondents view teacher role cognitions in terms of their own needs--particularly when deciding norms for the teacher. (b) Respondents become more sophisticated as they age or as they enter the school system. (c) Respondents who are in direct contact with teachers (Pupils) are more reality-oriented with regard to how horrible teachers really are. Each of these tentatively tenable propositions bears additional testing out in other aspects of the data.

Conclusion

Positional comparisons for norms and expectations for teacher entrance into settings were made. Findings indicate that positions are quite dissimilar in many areas in their cognitions when selecting items used in mapping the teacher position. The implications of these findings is reserved for Chapter VIII of this volume.

CHAPTER III

VOLUNTEERED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER TRAITS

Introduction

Form Two of the Role Study asked respondents to volunteer traits of teachers. The responses given are presumed to be salient aspects of teacher role and may be analysed for differences among the several community positions. Respondents were asked to give teacher traits desired (positive norms), not desired (negative norms), and expected with multiple responses elicited for each question. The numerous responses given were coded using a list of content categories developed from the traits actually volunteered. A number of trait 'types' were isolated and then a variety of content categories provided for each type of trait. Trait types included: (1) Actions (verbal descriptions of teacher behavior). (2) Manners (adverbal descriptions of behavior). (3) imputed cognitive structures (teacher attitudes, abilities, etc.) (4) Features. (5) Backgrounds (historical statements about the teacher's past). (6) Reactions of others to teachers. Coders were instructed to choose the single, 'cominant' aspect of the reponse for coding. Coded responses were then punched onto IBM cards for analysis, and only those response categories used by five percent or more of respondents are reported here.

The data have been analyzed by two methods. (1) Those content areas chosen for study (53 reported by 5% or more respondents) were subjected to a _t_ test designed to determine significance of difference between positions on the basis of percentage of usage of the content areas. (2) Responses were also assigned a scale point (Points ranged from 1-5. Point 1 indicated presence or high frequency of the item; point 5 indicated absence or low frequency of the content item) and discrepancies between positions and within positions have been determined by use of the Mann-Whitney Z_u.

Tables of Results and Findings Based on Percentage of Usage

Table 3.1 is made up of six content items showing positional differences for "teacher professionalism and discipline". It may be seen in this table that there is a relatively similar pattern of differences among positions for these six items. Four of the content areas are classified as actions and two are classified as manners. Major discrepancies in content area usage occur between teachers, pupils and parents. There is also a rather consistent pattern of differences between school officials, parents and pupils. For three of the content areas ("professionally," "does not discriminate," and "firmly"), most of the discrepancies stem from negative norm usage. For the remaining items, differences stem from all three types of cognitions.

Findings displayed in this table indicate that the concern of various positions with this general area of teacher characteristics shifts from content area to content area. For example, it may be noted that for the content items, "professionally" and "disciplines," teachers have a higher frequency of usage than do parents and pupils. But for the remaining content areas where teachers differ significantly from parents and pupils, parents and pupils exhibit a higher frequency of usage. A similar distinction may be noted for school officials as contrasted with other positions. School officials use more frequently than parents or pupils the content item, "professionally," while parents and pupils, as contrasted with school officials, use more frequently the content items, "does not discriminate," "firmly," and "enforces". Parents, as contrasted with pupils, use more frequently the content items, "professionally," "does not discriminate," and "disciplines." Pupils, as contrasted with parents, use more frequently the content items, "firmly," "enforces," and "permits." No disagreements may be found in this table between teachers and school officials.

Table 3.2 displays significant differences in content area usage for "job-related teacher characteristics". Eight content areas are included in this category, and a consistent pattern of differences may be [illegible] crepancies are between teachers and school officials versus parents and pupils. No discrepancies may be found either between teachers and school officials, or between parents and pupils. One of the content items included within this table is a feature ("teacher age"). It should be noted that this is the only feature trait volunteered with high frequency by respondents. Another content item in this table is an action ("expressed satisfaction"), while the remainder are classified as manners.

Most of the content items included in Table 3.2 are used more frequently by the professional groups (teachers and school officials) than by parents and pupils. Only one is used more frequently by parents and pupils ("teacher age"). It might be speculated that the more sophisticated the respondent, the less likely he is to use cognitions referring to features; indeed, the less likely he is to think about features at all. Sophisticated respondents would appear more likely to be concerned with teacher productivity and performance than with the "type" of teacher performing the job.

Table 3.3 includes findings for content items dealing with "teacher ability and interest." Three of the content items included within this table are imputed cognitive structures and one is a background. All of the significant differences found in this table stem from disagreements between pupils and the other three positions. No discrepancies occur between teachers and parents, teachers and school officials, or parents and school officials. Differences are found for all three types of cognition. It may be noted that pupils use less frequently than the other positions all of the content areas specified in this table. This, again, is reflective of a difference in the level of sophistication of various positions.

TABLE 3.1

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE
FOR "TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM AND DISCIPLINE"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Professionally (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	17.643***	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	28.710***	24.049***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	11.042***	19.175***
Parents - Sch. Off.	-11.372*	-19.420**	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	-30.462***	-23.440***
Content Area, Does Not Discriminate (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	—	-27.622***	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	-11.242**	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	16.380***	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	31.384***	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	15.004***	—
Content Area, Firmly (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	-18.760***	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	-19.149***	-18.547***	-20.588**
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	-13.131***	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	14.983**	7.061*	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	15.372**	20.192***	20.192***
Content Area, Enforces (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	-7.350***	—	-4.567*
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	-4.909*	—	-4.567*
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	6.878**	—	5.115*
Content Area, Disciplines (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	6.702*	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	2.252*	2.252*
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	—

TABLE 3.1 (Continued)

Content Area, Permits (Action)

Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	-5.342***	-6.279***
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	—

Note: For Tables 3.1 through 3.9, a negative sign in percentage difference indicates that the position listed second in the comparison exhibits the greater percentage. Differences significant at $.01 < p < .05$ are indicated with a single asterisk; at $.001 < p < .01$ with two asterisks; and, at $p < .001$ with three asterisks.

TABLE 3.2

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "JOB-RELATED TEACHER CHARACTERISTICS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Well-Groomed (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	9.270*	—	8.768*
Teachers - Pupils	—	11.620**	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	-11.326*	-13.496*	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-11.914*	-18.154***	—
Content Area, Expresses Satisfaction (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	—	10.189**	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	7.539*	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	-17.819***	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	-19.374***	—
Content Area, Diligently (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	13.132***	16.311***
Teachers - Pupils	—	13.845***	16.744***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	-19.742***	-14.834**
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	-20.455***	-15.267**
Content Area, Young (Feature)			
Teachers - Parents	—	-7.056***	-5.247*
Teachers - Pupils	-5.147**	-4.266*	-6.774**
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	5.815**
Pupils - Sch. Off.	4.675*	—	7.318***
Content Area, Knowledgeably (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	11.546*	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	14.218**	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	-13.450*	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-16.122**	—	—

TABLE 3.2 (Continued)

Content Area, Personably (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	8.863*	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	-11.326*	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-14.997**	-7.022*	—
Content Area, Creatively (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	-7.417*	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-7.193*	—	-8.685*
Content Area, Enthusiastically (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	4.662*	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	-7.417*	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-8.515*	—	-7.193*

TABLE 3.3

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "TEACHER ABILITY AND INTEREST"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Able to (Imputed Cognitive Structure)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	11.063**	7.282*	8.851*
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	6.644***	4.119**	10.433***
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-15.708**	-11.059**	-12.282**
Content Area, Interested in (Imputed Cognitive Structure)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	16.003***	9.462**	14.982***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	15.595***	9.776***	17.133***
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	-10.178*	-25.445***
Content Area, Enjoys (Imputed Cognitive Structure)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	5.443**	—	5.763**
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-10.789*	—	—
Content Area, Well-Educated (Background)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	6.401*	—	9.323**
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	5.930**	—	7.195***
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-10.178*	-6.581*	-12.551**

Table 3.4 includes four items concerned with "teacher rapport and orderliness". Major discrepancies occur between pupils and teachers, parents and school officials. Three of the content items included are manners and one is an action. It may be seen that pupils use less frequently than school officials, parents and teachers, the content items, "cooperates," "honestly," and "orderly." Pupils, however, use more frequently than teachers and parents the content item, "interesting." Other findings in this table indicate that school officials, more than teachers and parents, use the content items, "cooperates" and "honestly." (This may, however, because of its rare occurence, be only a random pattern.)

Table 3.5 displays findings relevant to "teacher ethics". Three content items are included, two of which are manners and one of which is an action. Major discrepancies are found between teachers and pupils, teachers and parents, parents and pupils, and pupils and school officials. Teachers as contrasted with parents and pupils, use more frequently the content items, "is broadminded" and "ethically". Pupils and parents, however, use more frequently than teachers the content item, "good". Parents and school officials use more frequently than pupils the content items, "is broadminded" and "ethically," while pupils use more frequently, "good." Again, these findings are reflective both of positional relationship to the school system and level of sophistication. Pupils and parents, more frequently than other positions, have a tendency to describe teacher characteristics in terms of vague generalities (e.g., "goodness"). It may be noted that there are no significant discrepancies between teachers and school officials or between parents and school officials.

Table 3.6 shows findings concerned with "reasonableness of teacher behavior." Only one item (a manner) falls within this category, and it shows a distinct pattern of differences. No significant differences stem from positive norm usage. All of the discrepancies are between teachers and parents or pupils, and parents and pupils. Parents and pupils, more frequently than teachers, use

TABLE 3.4

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "TEACHER RAPPORT AND ORDERLINESS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Cooperates (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	14.425***	9.764**	8.442***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	-12.184*
Parents - Pupils	9.888***	6.867***	7.488**
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	-13.158*
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-20.014***	-15.977***	-20.626***
Content Area, Honestly (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	4.718*	—
Teachers - Pupils	4.662*	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	-11.315*
Parents - Pupils	4.175**	—	3.679*
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	-7.078*	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-10.007**	—	-15.096**
Content Area, Orderly (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	16.142***	8.002*	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	11.252***	—	5.043*
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	-10.695*	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-11.131*	-12.723**	—
Content Area, Interesting (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	-5.448*	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	-3.252*	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	—

TABLE 3.5

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "TEACHER ETHICS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Is Broadminded (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	8.768*	13.321**	16.155***
Teachers - Pupils	12.223**	20.944***	19.365***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	7.623**	3.842*
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-14.827**	-12.795*	-10.349*
Content Area, Good (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	-8.210***
Teachers - Pupils	—	-6.028**	-23.649***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	-21.201***	-6.279***	-15.439***
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	20.192***
Content Area, Ethically (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	6.491*	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	8.304**	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	4.119**	—	4.083*
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-8.074*	—	-7.634*

TABLE 3.6

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "REASONABLENESS OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Reasonably (Manner0			
Teachers - Parents	—	-7.323**	-3.595*
Teachers - Pupils	—	-18.084***	-9.993***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	-10.761**	-6.398**
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	—

TABLE 3.7

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR "EMOTIONAL SUPPORT OF PUPILS"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Helps (Action			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	-9.363*	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	-10.823**	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch, Off.	15.714***		
Content Area, Kindly (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	—	-5.610*	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	-6.615***	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	8.215*	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	8.298*	—	—
Content Area, Thoughtfully (Manner)			
Teachers-- Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	9.952*	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	-21.242***	—	7.169*
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch, Off.	—	—	—
Content Area, Sincerely (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	8.442**	—	9.903**
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	4.007*	4.336*	4.832**
Parents - Sch. Off.	-12.141*	—	-14.742**
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-16.148***	-9.738*	-19.574***
Content Area, Lovingly (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	18.785***	—	9.580*
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	17.357***	—	13.889***
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	-8.140*	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	-16.759***	-8.715*	-12.184*

the content item, "reasonably" and pupils, more than parents, use this content item. This may be reflective of the fact that saliency of content areas is dependent in part upon the extent to which "effects" may be felt. Thus, this would be a very salient content area for pupils and parents because they are the recipients of teacher behavior.

Table 3.7 displays findings for four content areas related to the general area of "emotional support of pupils". Three of the content items are manners and one is an action. The major trend indicated is the discrepancy between pupils and all other positions. Pupils, more frequently than other position members, use the content items, "helps" and "kindly", while other positions use, "sincerely" and "lovingly". An inconsistent pattern is found for the content item, "thoughtfully," where pupils exhibit a less frequent usage than teachers and, for expectational usage, a less frequent usage than parents. But for positive norms, pupils exhibit a more frequent usage than parents for this content item. A few differences may be observed in this table between parents and school officials also. School officials use more frequently than parents the content items, "sincerely" and lovingly," while on the content item, "kindly," parents exhibit a more frequent usage.

Significant differences relating to the general area of "teacher motivation and interaction" are displayed in Table 3.8. Three content items are included, one of which is an imputed cognitive structure, one a manner, and one an action. Significant differences in this table stem from disagreements between teachers and all other positions. Teachers use the content item, "friendly" more than do parents and pupils, while pupils exhibit a higher usage of the content area, "discusses" than do teachers. Also, parents and school officials use the content item, "motivated to" more than teachers. All of the significant differences stem from expectational usage for the content item, "motivated to" and all of the differences for the content area, "friendly" are over positive norm usage.

TABLE 3.8

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE FOR

"TEACHER MOTIVATION AND INTERACTION"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Motivated to (Imputed Cognitive Structure)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	-6.436
Teachers - Pupils	—	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	-15.793**
Parents- Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Content Area, Friendly (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	10.612*	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	14.753**	—	—
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Content Area, Discusses (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	—	—	—
Teachers - Pupils	-7.211**	—	-12.195***
Teachers - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Parents - Pupils	—	—	—
Parents - Sch. Off.	—	—	—
Pupils - Sch. Off.	—	—	—

Differences for the content item, "discusses" are for both positive norm and expectational usage.

Table 3.9 is composed of two items relevant to "teacher improvement and humor." Differences are found between parents and school officials or teachers and between pupils and parents or school officials. One difference is found between teachers and school officials. Teachers and school officials, more than parents, use the content item, "improves". Teachers and pupils, more than parents and school officials, use the content item, "humorously".

Summary of Findings Based on Percentage of Usage

Nine hundred and fifty-four *t* tests were run to determine the significance of difference in percentage of use of the 33 content items by teachers, parents, pupils and school officials. Usage by the various positions of the content items as expectations, positive norms and negative norms was considered. Statistical analyses indicated 206 differences significant at $p < .05$. Table 3.10 A summarizes comparative results in terms of significant differences among positions in usage of content areas by expectations, positive norms and negative norms. Table 3.10 B shows grand totals for significant differences by cognition type and code category dimension.

Several noticeable trends are evident in these two summary tables. First, it should be noted that there is an overall pattern of consistency in the number of significant differences by positional comparison across cognition type. That is, the number of significant differences in percentage use of content areas is approximately the same for all three cognition types for any positional comparison. This indicates consistency in the way members of any given position describe teacher characteristics--and this pattern is but little influenced by cognitive frame of reference.

The majority of significant differences (for all three types of cognitions) involve pupils versus adult respondents. This finding is perhaps reflective of

TABLE 3.9

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA

USAGE FOR "TEACHER IMPROVEMENT AND HUMOR"

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Content Area, Improves (Action)			
Teachers - Parents	--	4.710*	-8.281***
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch. Off.	--	--	--
Parents - Pupils	--	--	--
Parents - Sch. Off.	-2.757*	--	-14.494
Pupils - Sch. Off.	--	--	--
Content Area, Humorously (Manner)			
Teachers - Parents	13.972**	--	--
Teachers - Pupils	--	--	--
Teachers - Sch. Off.	12.078*	--	--
Parents - Pupils	-10.928**	-4.224*	-10.635***
Parents - Sch. Off.	--	--	--
Pupils - Sch. Off.	--	--	8.126*

TABLE 3.10A

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE, BY POSITION, CODE DIMENSION, AND COGNITION TYPE

		Teachers				Parents				Pupils				Sch. Officials			Totals			
		+N	-N	E		+N	-N	E		+N	-N	E		+N	-N	E	+N	-N	E	Totals
Teachers	Actions																6	9	7	22
	Manners																17	14	12	43
	Imp. Cog. Str.																2	2	4	8
	Features																1	2	2	5
	Backgrounds																1	0	1	2
	Total																27	27	26	80
Parents	Actions	1	4	2	7												4	11	9	24
	Manners	5	5	4	14												22	20	16	58
	Imp. Cog. Str.	0	0	1	1												3	2	4	9
	Features	0	1	1	2												1	1	2	4
	Backgrounds	0	0	0	0												1	0	1	2
	Total	6	10	8	24												31	34	32	97
Pupils	Actions	5	5	4	14	2	5	5	12								10	14	12	36
	Manners	11	9	7	27	8	8	10	26								31	25	28	84
	Imp. Cog. Str.	2	2	2	6	3	2	3	8								7	6	7	20
	Features	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	1								4	1	2	7
	Backgrounds	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2								3	1	3	7
	Total	20	17	15	52	15	15	19	49								55	47	52	154
School Officials	Actions	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	5	3	4	3	10				4	6	6	16
	Manners	1	0	1	2	9	7	2	18	12	8	11	31				22	15	15	51
	Imp. Cog. Str.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6				2	2	3	7
	Features	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	3				2	0	2	4
	Backgrounds	0	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	3				1	1	1	3
	Total	1	0	3	4	10	9	5	24	20	15	18	53				31	24	27	81

Note: In this table, +N refers to Positive Norm; -N refers to Negative Norm; and E refers to Expectation.

TABLE 3.10B

GRAND TOTALS FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREA USAGE BY CODE DIMENSION AND COGNITION TYPE

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Total
Actions	12	20	17	49
Manners	46	37	35	118
Imputed Cognitive Structures	7	6	9	22
Features	4	2	4	10
Backgrounds	3	1	3	7
Total	72	66	68	206

a differential in the types of interactions the respondents have had with teachers as a basis for their cognitions. It is also suggestive of a difference in level of sophistication. A second major classification of significant differences is the parent-professional interest group comparisons. This finding is perhaps also reflective of differences in the types of relationships the respondents have had with teachers. Parents represent a lay point of view versus the professional point of view shared by teachers and school officials—perhaps because of similar socialization processes required for membership in their positions. This is borne out by the fact that teachers and school officials are involved, when compared one against the other, in only four significant differences.

Figure 3.11 summarizes content areas used predominantly by the various positions for the three cognition types.

Several interesting patterns may be observed in Figure 3.11. First, it will be noted that there is overall similarity in the content areas used predominantly by teachers, parents and school officials, with the greatest similarity being between teachers and school officials (the professional interest groups). It may also be observed that the pupil respondents are rather unique in terms of content area usage. The content areas conceptualized and expressed by pupils are, for the most part, at a relatively low level of sophistication. Content areas used by pupils are related, on the one hand to the issue of pupil freedom, and on the other, to a very vague set of "all-American ethics" for teachers. Adults, especially teachers and school officials, are concerned with teacher ability and specific levels of interactional performance, and display a much wider variety of content areas. Finally, it will be noted that there is a great deal of interdependence in the usage of content areas by all positions across cognition type.

Figure 3.11

PREDOMINANT POSITIONAL USAGE OF CONTENT AREA, BY COGNITION TYPE

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Teachers	Able to Cooperates Enthusiastically Friendly Honestly Humorously Interested in Is broadminded Knowledgeably Lovingly Orderly Personably Sincerely Thoughtfully Well educated Well groomed	Able to Cooperates Diligently Disciplines Ethically Expresses satisfaction Honestly Improves Is broadminded Orderly Professionally Well Groomed	Ableto Diligently Improves Interested in Is broadminded Lovingly Professionally Sincerely Well educated Well groomed
School Officials	Able to Cooperates Creatively Enjoys Enthusiastically Ethically Honestly Improves Is broadminded Knowledgeably Lovingly Orderly Personably Professionally Sincerely Well educated Well groomed	Able to Cooperates Diligently Expresses Satisfaction Honestly Interested in Is broadminded Lovingly Orderly Personably Professionally Sincerely Well educated Well groomed	Able to Cooperates Creatively Diligently Enthusiastically Ethically Honestly Improves Interested in Is broadminded Lovingly Motivated to Professionally Sincerely Well educated

Figure 3.11 (Continued)

	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation
Parents	Able to Cooperates Enjoys Ethically Firmly Honestly Interested in Kindly Lovingly Orderly Well educated	Able to Cooperates Disciplines Does not discriminate Interested in Sincerely Young	Able to Disciplines Enjoys Ethically Honestly Interested in Lovingly Motivated to Orderly Professionally Thoughtfully Well educated Young
Pupils	Discusses Enforces Firmly Good Helps Humorously Interesting Kindly Young	Firmly Good Humorously Interesting Kindly Permits Young	Discusses Enforces Firmly Good Humorously Permits Young

TABLE 3.12

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG TEACHERS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg Norm
ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
Is broadminded	1.636**	1.523***	--
Controls others	2.250*	--	--
Controls self	--	2.333*	--
Does not discriminate	--	--	1.667**
Disciplines	--	3.000*	--
Expresses satisfaction	--	3.800**	--
MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
Diligently	--	.737*	--
Friendly	--	--	- .571*
Personably	1.167*	--	--
Professionally	1.667**	1.390**	--
Well groomed	1.000**	1.000**	--
IMPUTED COGNITIVE STRUCTURES			
Able to	1.455**	--	--
BACKGROUND			
Well educated	1.800*	--	--

Tables of Results Based on Scaled Points

Interpositional comparison of these data produced only random significance. Of 954 comparisons that were made, only twenty were found to be significant at $p < .05$ level of confidence. Therefore it is felt there is no justification for attempting any interpretation. We may direct our attention to the interpretation of intrapositional disparities.

In Table 3.12 teachers, as a group of respondents, exhibit seven cognitive discrepancies over content areas used as expectations and positive norms. Teachers feel that teachers should be broadminded, control others, be personable and professional, be well groomed, have ability and be well educated. In all cases with respect to these content areas, however, teachers do not expect teachers to have these characteristics to the degree desired. This finding indicates that idealized cognitions about the public school teacher (for certain content areas) do not coincide with reality cognitions about this particular role as expressed by teachers themselves.

Seven cognitive discrepancies were found when contrasting usage of content areas as expectations and negative norms. For all of these comparisons, the rank distributions for the negative norms have been inverted. Statistical significance derived from comparing non-inverted negative norms and expectations would not imply conflict for teachers. That is, if the presence of a content item is expected and the absence is disliked, this would be no problem for the teacher. Therefore, all of the negative norm rank distributions have been inverted so that any statistically significant differences found are indicative of potential conflict. All of the expectation-negative norm comparisons included in Table 3.12 may be interpreted as meaning that the absence of certain content areas is disliked and teachers are expected not to have (or exhibit) these characteristics. Thus, teachers dislike teachers to not be broadminded, not discipline pupils, not express satisfaction, not con-

TABLE 3.13

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG PARENTS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
Is broadminded	1.722**	1.722***	--
Controls others	2.111***	1.911**	--
Cooperates	.873***	.873**	--
Controls self	--	.823*	--
Discusses	2.371**	--	- .909*
Does not discriminate	2.867**	3.121***	--
Expresses satisfaction	--	3.000**	--
Helps	.321*	--	--
MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
Creatively	--	2.123*	--
Ethically	1.120***	--	--
Fairly	.886**	1.830***	--
Firmly	--	--	-1.084**
Friendly	.308**	--	- .100*
Happily	2.200**	2.400***	--
Lovingly	.294**	--	--
Patiently	1.007***	.814*	--
Personably	.769**	--	- .250*
Professionally	1.961***	1.961***	--
Reasonably	2.267*	2.667***	--
Sincerely	.873*	--	--
Thoughtfully	.679***	.637*	--
Well groomed	.826**	.824**	--

trol themselves, not be diligent, professional or well groomed. But the presence of these characteristics is not expected of teachers--and this difference between what is expected and what is disliked is statistically significant.

Only two items ("does not discriminate", and "friendly") resulted in positive norm-negative norm cognitive discrepancies within the teacher position. Here, as in the case of the expectation-negative norm comparisons, the rank distributions for negative norms have been inverted so that statistically significant findings are indicative of role conflict for teachers. It was found that teachers, as a group of respondents, dislike teacher discrimination (as indicated by negative norm usage) but (for positive norm usage) do not like the absence of this characteristic as strongly. For the content area, friendly, a slightly different type of discrepancy is found. Teachers like teachers to be friendly, but do not dislike the absence of this characteristic as strongly.

Of the 16 cognitive discrepancies reported in Table 3.12, seven were based on content items classified as actions, seven were based on manners, one was based on an imputed cognitive structure and one based on a background. It may also be noted that several of the content items involved in expectation-positive norm discrepancies were also involved in expectation-negative norm discrepancies. There were, however, no overlaps between the expectation-normative comparisons and the normative-normative analysis.

Results from the intra-positionally determined conflict analysis based on parents as a respondent group are presented in Table 3.13. Twenty-two conflicts stem from expectation-positive norm disparities. For all of the content items involved in this type of comparison, parents like the presence of the characteristic but do not expect to find it in teachers. Again, this is reflective of a discrepancy between idealized cognitions held by parents

TABLE 3.13--Continued

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
FEATURES			
Pleasant voice	.800*	--	--
IMPUTED COGNITIVE STRUCTURES			
Able to	.665*	.882*	--
Interested in	.727***	.727**	--
BACKGROUNDS			
Well educated	.810*	--	--

for teachers and reality cognitions. Six of the content items involved are classified as actions, twelve are manners, two are imputed cognitive structures, one is a feature and one is a background.

Sixteen conflicts stem from expectation-negative norm disparities. All of the negative norm distributions have been inverted. For all of the content items involved in this type of comparison, parents dislike the absence of the implied characteristics but do not expect to find it in teachers. Six of the sixteen statistically significant disparities are based on action content areas, eight are based on manners and two are based on imputed cognitive structures.

Four disparities were found in the positive norm-negative norm comparison (where negative norms were inverted), one of which was based on an action content area and three of which were based on manner content areas. For all of these content items, the presence of the implied characteristics is approved by parents and the absence of the characteristics is not disapproved.

Table 3.14 displays significant results from the intra-positionally determined conflict analysis based on discrepancies within the pupil position. There were eighteen expectation-positive norm disparities, seven of which were based on content items classified as actions and eleven of which were based on manners. All of these discrepancies stem from the fact that teachers are not expected by pupils to have certain characteristics to the desired extent.

Thirteen cognitive disparities were found to stem from the expectation-negative norm comparison. Four of these disparities were based on content items classified as actions, eight were based on manners and one was based on a feature. On all of these content areas the conflict stems from the fact that pupils dislike the absence of certain characteristics in teachers and these characteristics are not expected in teachers. (All negative norms have been inverted.)

TABLE 3.14

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG PUPILS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
ACTION CONTENT AREAS			
Is broadminded	2.857**	2.857**	--
Controls self	2.167**	2.417***	.250*
Discusses	.500*	--	- .895*
Does not discriminate	2.038**	2.268***	--
Enforces	.867*	--	-1.818**
Expresses satisfaction	--	3.333*	--
Helps	.184***	--	- .444*
Permits	1.138**	--	- .488*
MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
Democratically	2.375*	2.375*	--
Fairly	1.3[illegible]**	1.215**	--
Firmly	--	1.411***	-1.310**
Friendly	.324*	--	--
Good	.391***	--	--
Happily	1.400*	1.366**	--
Humorously	.754***	.813*	--
Interesting	1.714**	1.714*	--
Kindly	--	..654*	--
Patiently	.765*	--	--
Reasonably	.056**	2.000***	--
Thoughtfully	.500*	--	--
Well groomed	.400*	--	--
FEATURES			
Young	--	1.617**	1.596**

There were seven positive norm-negative norm disparities, five of which were based on actions, one on a manner and one on a feature. For this comparison, also, the negative norms have been inverted. It may be seen that for all content areas with the exception of, "controls self" and "young", significant differences stem from the fact that pupils like the presence of the implied characteristics but do not dislike the absence of the characteristics. Regarding the content items, "controls self" and "young," pupils dislike the absence of these qualities but are not desirous of their presence.

Three cognitive discrepancies were found in the analysis of cognitions given by school officials. These are shown in Table 3.15. Once again, these few significant differences might have appeared by chance alone and are not further interpretated.

Summary of Findings Based on Scaled Points

Results reported here have been based on statistical analyses of apparent scale points given by position respondents for content items descriptive of teacher traits. Analyses have been made of discrepancies in scale points given within cognition type for content areas by members of different positions (inter-positional analysis) and also of discrepancies within given positions in scale points given for content areas used as more than one cognition type (intra-positional analysis).

Nine hundred and fifty-four inter-positional comparisons were made and twenty statistically significant disparities were found. It was suggested, however, that this small a number of significant items might possibly have occurred by chance alone. For the intra-positional analyses, a total of 159 comparisons were made for each of the four positions. For all positions with the exception of school officials, more than random significance was found. Table 3.16 displays the number of significant intra-positional disparities

TABLE 3.15

INTRA-POSITIONAL ROLE CONFLICTS BASED ON COGNITIVE DISCREPANCIES AMONG SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Content	Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos.Norm-Neg. Norm
MANNER CONTENT AREAS			
Is broadminded	2.111*	2.034*	--
Well groomed	.900*	--	--

TABLE 3.16

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTRA-POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY POSITION AND TYPE OF COGNITIVE COMPARISON

Position	Exp.-P.Norm	Exp.-N.Norm	P.Norm-N.Norm	Totals
Teachers	7	7	2	16
Parents	22	16	4	42
Pupils	18	13	7	38
School Officials		RANDOM SIGNIFICANCE ONLY		
TOTALS	47	36	13	96

TABLE 3.17

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INTRA-POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY POSITION AND CONTENT AREA DIMENSION

Position	Actions	Manners	Features	Imputed Cognitive Structures	Back-grounds	Totals
Teachers	7	7	0	1	1	16
Parents	13	23	1	4	1	42
Pupils	16	20	2	0	0	38
School Officials	RANDOM SIGNIFICANCE ONLY					
Totals	36	50	3	5	2	96

which were found, organized by position and type of cognitive comparison.

It may be observed that most of the intra-positional disparities occur with contrasting positional usage of content items for expectations and positive norms. This trend holds for all positions. This finding indicates a discrepancy between idealized cognitions held for certain teacher characteristics and the reality cognitions held for these same characteristics. Also, a relatively large proportion of the disparities stem from the expectational-invertged negative norm comparisons. This seems to indicate that there is considerable consonance between what various position members dislike and expect to find by way of teacher characteristics. Very few significant disparities are found when contrasting positional usage of content areas as positive norms and negative norms (inverted).

Most of the significant intra-positional disparities occur within the parent and pupil positions. Teachers exhibit relatively few significant disparities, while school officials exhibit only random significance.

Certain patterns of differences are found when comparing the number of disparities for the various content area dimensions. Table 3.17 shows the number of significant intra-positional disparities found for each position according to content area dimension.

Table 3.17 indicates that teachers exhibit the same number of significant disparities over content areas classified as actions and those classified as manners. However, both parents and pupils exhibit more disparities over manners. Generally speaking, the action categories are more specific in nature than the manner categories. The findings indicated in Table 3.17 may suggest that parents and pupils have a tendency to speak in generalities about teacher characteristics, while teachers themselves, having been professionally socialized, are more concerned with specific aspects of the teacher role. Overall, content areas classified as features, imputed cognitive struc-

TABLE 3.18

CONTENT AREAS INVOLVED UNIQUELY IN POSITIONAL COGNITIVE DISPARITIES

INTER-POSITIONAL COMPARISONS		INTRA-POSITIONAL COMPARISONS		
Position		Expectation-Pos. Norm	Expectation-Neg. Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg. Norm
Teachers			Disciplines Diligently	Does not discriminate
Parents	Random significance only	Cooperates Ethically Lovingly Professionally Sincerely Pleasant voice Interested in	Cooperates Creatively Controls others Patiently Professionally Thoughtfully Able to Interested in	Creatively Personably
Pupils		Controls self Enforces Permits Democratically Good Humorously Interesting	Democratically Firmly Humorously Interesting Kindly Young	Controls self Helps Permits Young
School Officials		Random Significance Only		

tures, or backgrounds occur rarely in intra-positional discrepancies.

Certain content areas were involved uniquetly in some of the positional disparities. A list of these content areas, categorized by position and type of cognitive disparity, is presented in Figure 3.18. It may be seen that only three content areas are unique to cognitive disparities among teachers, while a much larger number is unique to parents and pupils. Generally, the content areas disagreed upon uniquely by parents and by pupils are concerned with the issue of emotional support of pupils and have a tendency to be more general than those unique to teachers. Parents and pupils disagree among themselves on approximately the same number of unique content areas for both the expectation-positive norm, and expectation-negative norm comparisons, while teachers do not disagree among themselves on any unique content areas for the expectation-positive norm comparison.

Four different content areas were found to be commonly involved in intra-positional disparities for teachers, parents, and pupils. These content areas, organized according to type of cognitive disparity are displayed in Figure 3.19.

It might be suggested that the content areas included in Figure 3.19 represent especial areas of general concern and controversy on the part of respondents. It should be noted that there are no common content areas involved in positive norm-negative norm disparities. Overall, there are considerably more content areas uniquely than commonly involved in intra-positional disparities for the various positions.

Conclusion

The diffuse findings of this chapter may be summarized in terms of the two types of analysis.

Findings for Usage. 3.11 The majority of significant differences stemmed from a comparison of pupils versus adults and from parents versus teachers

TABLE 3.19

CONTENT AREAS COMMON TO TEACHERS, PARENTS, AND PUPILS FOR INTRA-POSITIONAL DISPARITIES

Expectation-Positive Norm	Expectation-Negative Norm	Pos. Norm-Neg.Norm
Is broadminded	Is broadminded	
Well groomed	Controls self	
	Expresses satisfaction	

and school officials. In general, parents tended to stand between pupils and school personnel, but rather closer to the former in patterns of usage.

3.12 The majority of content areas involved in significant differences for usage were classified as manners (rather than as actions or other characteristics of behavior).

3.13 Content areas used predominantly by pupils were concerned on the one hand with pupil freedom, and on the other with a vague set of "all-American ethics" for teachers. Adults, especially teachers and school officials, used content areas predominatly which were concerned with teacher ability and specific levels of interactional performance.

3.14 A wider variety of content areas was used by adults than by pupils.

3.15 The number of significant differences for any positional comparison did not vary greatly according to cognition type.

Findings for Scale Point Analysis. 3.21 Positions did not differ significantly in scale points assigned to voluntered teacher traits.

3.22 Expectations and positive norms tended to be more disparate in scale points assigned than did either expectations and (inverted) negative norms or positive and (inverted) negative norms. Respondents tend to note differences between idealized and expected teacher traits (which does not show up when considering disliked traits).

3.23 Parents and pupils tend to speak in generalities about teacher traits, while teachers are more concerned with specific teacher behaviors. Parents and pupils tend to see disparities between norms and expectations primarily for the issue of emotional support of the pupil.

3.24 Positions differ considerably in content areas for which they see norms and expectations for teachers as discrepant.

Interpretation of these findings is left until Chapter VIII.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

CHAPTER IV

VOLUNTERED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIORS

Introduction

Form One of the Role Study asked respondents to state positive norms, negative norms and expectations for teacher behaviors for forty specified backgrounds in the school. For any given background a respondent was asked for five statements of liked, five statements of dislikes, and ten statements of expected teacher behavior. To reduce respondent fatigue, five copies of the form were prepared, and each respondent was given only eight backgrounds for which teacher behaviors were specified. Thus, approximately 1/5 of each respondent position dealt with any background, and each respondent gave several answers for any given background.

Responses were coded in terms of six dimensions of content with each dimension having numerous content categories available. The six dimensions were:

Dimension (1) - Actions (verbal descriptions of teacher behavior)

Dimension (2) - Manners (Adverbal descriptions of teacher behavior)

Dimension (3) - Imputed cognitive structure (Assesments of teachers' feelings, attitudes and the like)

Dimension (4) - Purpose of behavior (Endstates)

Dimension (5) - Target (Social object towards whom behavior was directed)

Dimension (6) - Sub-position (Particularistic identification of the teacher as belonging to a sub-category of teachers)

Each response was coded for all six dimensions (including an empty code if the dimension was inapplicable to the response). Thus, in coded form, voluntered responses were tabulated as combinations of code categories reflecting these dimensions only.

Dimensions 1, 2, and 3 were assigned a scaled rating which ranges from point 1 (doing, or the appearance of, a great deal of the item), to point 5 (not doing, or the appearance of, little of the item). Dimensions 4 and 5 were not so scaled. Dimension 6 was ignored for purposes of the analysis reported here.

As might be expected, certain items appeared over and over and apparently constituted salient or cognitively central frameworks used by respondents for mapping teacher behavior in the specified contexts. When all of the dimensional categories were jointly considered, certain combinations of high use emerged. From the more than 1,000,000 possible combinations of code categories taken up to five at a time; 153 unique combinations appeared that were volunteered by 5% or more of respondents for at least one background. A complete list of these unique, high-use combination items appears in Appendix B_1. In this chapter, the four community positions are compared for usage of these items.

Two types of comparison were made. (1) Comparisons were made between positions for percentage of respondents who volunteered each of the 153 items. This comparison was initiated to discover whether items held differential saliency for the four positions studied. Basic data for item usage by positions is given in Appendices B_2, B_3, B_4, and B_5. Comparisons between positions for usage were made using a t test for significance. (2) Comparisons were also made between positions for central tendency of scaled ratings - that is, whether there were differences between positions as to whether teachers were seen as 'doing' or 'not doing' the item involved. These latter comparisons were made using the Mann-Whitney z_U. As it turned out, the number of significant comparisons found for this latter analysis did not exceed chance variation. Consequently, results will not be reported for the analysis. Lack of significance in this analysis is discussed in Chapter VIII.

In reporting findings, only differences which were significant at $p < .05$ or less have been reported. It should be noted for the analysis of usage, however, that out of 3,672 comparisons examined, 525 were found to be significant at $p < .05$. These differences are summarized in Table 4.1. Not all 153 high use items were equally fruitful in generating significant disparities for usage. Tables 4.2 through 4.9 summarize those 37 items for which at least three differences at $p < .05$ appeared.

TABLE 4.1

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OF PROPORTION OF USAGE FOR UNIQUE ITEMS BY POSITION AND COGNITION TYPE

Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials	Total
Positive Norm	18	24	9	33	18	11	113
Negative Norm	13	21	3	19	16	20	92
Expectation	20	28	5	23	11	19	106
Combined	28	56	14	47	32	37	214
Total	79	129	31	122	77	87	525

Tables of Results and Findings

In table 4.1 it should be noted that one set of comparisons combined cognition types. It is not surprising that the largest number of significant differences is found between positions when this comparison is considered. Other findings include the following:

4.11 The number of positive norm and expectational differences are almost equal. If we were to plot the direction of difference it would be found that the sign of difference for positive norms and expectations almost always agrees. In fact when disagreement in sign occurs the disparity might be attributed to chance or there is no good explanation. Conversely, the sign of the negative norm will almost invariably be found to be the reverse of that for positive norms and expectations. The lower number of negative norm differences which appear in Table 4.1 can be interpreted as an indication that the respondents achieved a greater consensus for what they disliked that what they liked or expected for these items but not significantly so.

4.12 The majority of usage disparities involve comparisons of pupils with other positions. This has been a persistent finding throughout the study. Pupils are apparently the most unlike of all positions for their cognitive mappings of anything being considered. This is probably a reflection of the **naivete and lack of sophistication of the immature pupil respondents.**

4.13 Consistent with all other findings of the study, the number of teacher-school officials disparities are few in number. Not only do teacher and school officials appear to know what the members of these positions value and expect, they also apparently use the same frameworks when mapping the positions.

4.14 The large number of pupil-teacher disparities can probably be explained by assuming differential values and expectations held by members of the two

TABLE 4.2

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR ITEMS CONCERNED WITH TEACHERS' CONTROLLING PUPILS

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Instructs	PN	7.90*	9.89**				
	NN		4.68*				
	E	16.06***	16.36***				
	Com.	23.07***	25.05***			-15.79**	-17.77**
Interferes	PN	8.80**			-4.68**		
	NN	17.59***	14.36**				
	E	6.37*					
	Com.	26.01***	20.17***	17.25**			
Supervises	PN						-12.00*
	NN		8.09*		5.17**	-14.30**	
	EE		8.62*		5.70*	-10.55*	-16.25**
	Com.		16.82***		10.21***	- 8.81*	-24.62***
Officiates	PN						
	NN						
	E		-12.73**			-17.06***	-15.83**
	Com.	8.92*	8.37*			-18.51***	-17.97***
Directs games	PN	7.01*	7.00*				
	NN		4.68*			-11.90**	-13.01**
	E	10.32**	12.35**				
	Com.	13.89**	16.29***			-15.79**	-18.20***
Instructs Tasks	PN						
	NN						
	E	10.06*	13.54**			-13.61**	-17.09***
	Com.	10.69*	15.20**			-13.07*	-17.58***
Supervises Pupils	PN						
	NN	9.04*	14.21***		5.17**		
	E		6.82*				-12.23*
	Com.		16.65***		7.61**	-15.02**	

positions. However, considering the fact that teachers and school officials show little difference in framework usage, why should there be considerably fewer disparities when pupils and school officials are compared than when teachers and pupils are compared? It is probable that schoool officials are more aware of the values and expectations of non-teaching positions than are teachers. The greater awareness by school officials is reflected in considerable similarity of framework usage and cognition type by school officials and non-teaching positions.

Table 4.2 summarizes seven items that are concerned with teachers' controlling pupils. There is a general pattern of similarity of direction for the disparities that do appear. The bulk of disparities involve teachers versus parents and pupils and parents and pupils versus school officials. For those comparisons in which school officials are involved greater item usage favors school officials.

4.21 There are very few positive norm differences for these items. There is a tendency for teachers to use interferes, instructs and directs games more than do parents and pupils. Notice, however, that there is an intense usage disparity for interfers as a disliked behavior between teachers and parents and teachers and pupils. The teachers are probably indicating a dislike for such behavior, but parents probably feel that interfering with childrens' activities is normal, while pupils accept interference as a matter of course.

4.22 Teachers use supervising pupils as a disliked activity more than do parents or pupils. Perhaps the teachers would like to give pupils more freedom, choice, or autonomy but are unable to do so for a variety of reasons, such as parents being opposed to too much pupil freedom or the danger of pupils disrupting the system.

4.23 The teachers used directs games and instructs as an expectation far more than did parents and pupils. Such activities are a regular part of

TABLE 4.3

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR ITEMS CONCERNED WITH PARTICIPATION AND STRESSING HEALTH

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Encourages	PN	8.54*	9.11*				
	NN					-9.68**	
	E		6.40*		2.60*		
	Com.	13.00**	15.83***				-18.36***
Helps	PN	17.32**	20.41*	22.20***			
	NN						
	E	23.96***	24.56***	18.27**			
	Com.	37.85***	41.39***	40.32***			
Helps Pupils	PN		-7.20*		-7.83*		
	NN	5.99*				-7.80*	
	E			-15.32**	-11.78**		-11.35*
	Com.		-10.92*	-15.48**	-17.15***	-21.72***	
Helps One Who Needs Assistance	PN		8.31*				
	NN						
	E	13.77***	11.19**			-8.83*	
	Com.	15.54**	15.06**				
Permits Choice of Pupils	PN	8.79*			-16.69***		12.75**
	NN				6.75**		
	E	8.54*			-5.75**		
	Com.	17.46***			-20.11***	11.82*	
Encourages Participation Pupils	PN				4.52**	-9.60*	
	NN						
	E						-8.53*
	Com.		7.91**		6.01***	-10.63*	-16.64***

the teachers' job and they know this. Not to expect such behavior would therefore, be unrealistic. It is probable that parents and pupils do not see such behaviors in the same light and therefore use different frameworks of reference for expectations.

4.24 It is evident from looking at the comparisons which involve the school officials that they are in close usage agreement with the teachers with the exception of a single item. Teachers used interferes significantly more than did school officials when cognitions were combined. The school officials were probably reflecting an awareness of a public stereotype which is contrary to the norms and expectations of teachers.

4.25 An item that indicates the large gap in cognitions between teachers and pupils is officiates. Pupils apparently expect teachers to officiate at games far more than do either teachers or school officials. It is probable that most teachers view this as a non-professional activity which is not a regular part of the teaching tasks. On the other hand parents and pupils include many activities into the teaching task that are not considered as appropriate or acceptable to teachers and school officials.

Table 4.3 summarizes six items that may be classified as teacher support of pupils behaviors. The patterns of disparities are inconsistent, and two items (helps) and (helps pupils) shows sharp teacher-school official disparities.

4.31 For item (111) helps, usage favors teachers sharply over parents, pupils, and school officials for positive norms, expectations, and combined cognitions. This takes on more meaning as we look at items (223) helps pupils and (224) helps one who needs assitance. Teachers apparently like and expect to help specific individuals who need help while for parents, pupils, and school officials, helping is a more diffuse concept that does not specify an individual but rather focuses on pupils in general. The teachers are apparently more reality oriented in this area and realize

TABLE 4.4

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR ITEMS CONCERNED WITH PARTICIPATION AND STRESSING HEALTH

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Teachers X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Stresses Health	PN				2.60*	-8.49*	-11.09**
	NN						
	E						
	Com.		7.49*		4.82*	-11.39*	-16.22***
Stresses Participation Pupils	PN	8.79*			-16.69***		-12.75**
	NN				2.60*		9.60*
	E		13.37***		-7.39***		-16.44***
	Com.	17.46**			-20.11***		-11.82**

that they can more effectively help specific pupils than attempting to treat all pupils in the same manner.

4.32 Item (323) permits choice of pupils generates considerable teacher-parent disparity. The teachers used this item more than did parents. This may indicate a basic difference in educational goals and philosophy between these two positions. Parents may see the school situation as that wherein pupils are to be controlled and directed by the teacher, while the teacher might like to see the pupils achieving autonomy and emancipation from control and supervision. The same interpretation could probably explain the teacher-parent usage disparities found for item (108) encourages. If directing and controlling are salient objects of parents' cognitions, then encouraging would tend to be secondary or de-emphasized.

Table 4.4 contains two items that produced few disparities which involved comparisons made with the teacher position but did generate a considerable number of disparities between parents, pupils, and school officials.

4.41 Parents and school officials both apparently like and expect teachers to stress more pupil participation than do pupils as is indicated by usage disparities. There are no apparent cognitive disparities of consequence between teachers, parents, and school officials. This may be indicative of an awareness by these positions of the greater part being played in the socialization of the child by the school. The same thing might be stated for item (261) stresses health that shows no teacher, parent, school official usage disparities. Such considerations are not salient for pupils and as a result they show low usage for these items.

Table 4.5 summarizes four items concerned with pattern maintenance. The signs and patterns of disparities are inconsistent. There are disparities for all cognition types and all positions are involved.

TABLE 4.5

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR ITEMS CONCERNED WITH PATTERN MAINTENANCE

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Teachers X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Maintains Order	PN	-11.66*	-15.59***		27.2***	20.90***	
	NN		15.34***		14.47***		-21.80***
	E				19.05***		-21.19***
	Com.		31.12***	-21.93**	34.38***		-24.32***
Maintains Atmosphere Conducive to Learning	PN	7.77*	10.80**		3.02*	-15.95**	-18.98***
	NN						
	E	8.03*	8.76**			-9.29*	-10.02**
	Com.	12.49**	15.06***			18.55***	
Verbalizes Quietly	PN						
	NN	13.89**	15.34***			-15.87**	-17.32***
	E						
	Com.	7.01*	9.11**				-9.83*
Maintains Quiet Pupils	PN		-9.65*	11.37*	-8.61*	12.42**	21.03***
	NN						
	E		-7.93*	8.71*	-8.41*	2.23**	
	Com.		-11.02*	14.59*	-11.11**	14.49**	25.61***

4.51 Item (238) maintains order, generated some confusing disparities. For positive norms parents' and pupils' usage is greater than teachers'. But, parents also used this item more than did pupils and school officials as a liked behavior. Evidently parents do not agree completely because enough use the item to prevent a usage disparity from appearing when teachers and parents are compared for negative norms or disliked behavior while a strong negative norm disparity appears for the teacher pupil comparisons. Parents indicate a much stronger dislike for the item than do pupils but school officials use the item for a disliked behavior more than do pupils. To say the least, maintains order must be very controversial, and while it is salient, order maintenance is not clearly defined for many persons.

4.52 Item (319) Maintains quiet pupils, illustrates the very wide gap (again) between the pupils and other positions. They used this item more than did teachers, parents, and far more than did school officials for positive norms, expectations and combined cognitions. It is surprising to find this as a positive norm for the pupils. It may be that quiet behavior assumes a forced saliency for the pupils and they are so sure this is the reality of the situation that it is impossible for them to think of it as a disliked behavior.

4.53 Item (240) maintains atmosphere conducive to learning shows higher usage by teachers and school officials than parents and pupils for positive norms, expectations, and combined cognitions. This is probably a reflection of emphasis due to the professional as opposed to the non-professional viewpoint. Teachers and school officials know the atmosphere of the school affects the functioning of the system, therefore maintaining a desirable atmosphere becomes salient. Parents and pupils are interested in other things (the least of which may be learning) and the result is considerable disparity when comparisons are made.

TABLE 4.6

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR ITEMS CONCERNED WITH TEACHER FEATURES, MANNERS, AND IMPUTED COGNITIVE STRUCTURE

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Courteously	PN			-15.79 **	-14.76 **	-17.94 ***	
	NN	-9.05 *	-11.15 **			-10.71 *	-12.81 **
	E						
	Com.		13.12		5.74	-15.41	-21.15
Pleasantly	PN		10.73		4.36		
	NN		-5.27 *		-2.60 *		
	E				2.60 *		
	Com.		12.35 **		7.39 ***		
Quietly	PN		-14.51 ***		-14.62 ***	12.30 *	
	NN						
	E		6.71 *		-7.21 **		10.32 ***
	Com.				-12.94 ***		
Well Groomed	PN		7.32 **		2.60 *	-8.11 *	
	NN				-4.09 **		-10.67 **
	E				2.26 *		
	Com.		10.55 ***		5.50 **	-9.52 *	-11.23 **
Interested In	PN				6.01 ***		
	NN		-14.81 ***		-18.15 ***		18.36 ***
	E				3.67 *		
	Com.		17.63 ***		22.25 ***		-21.57 ***
Appears Interested In	PN				-5.13 **		
	NN	-11.21 *	-18.29 ***		7.08 *		-12.81 **
	E				3.37 *		
	Com.		8.69 **		6.28 **		-7.91 *

4.54 Item (266) verbalizes quietly, shows greater usage by teachers and school officials than parents and pupils for negative norms. It is almost safe to assume that "quietly" has very different meanings for the professional groups than for the non-professional positions. The teachers and school officials probably are indicating a dislike of extreme silence or an over emphasis on keeping pupils quiet. Some noise is normal. Parents may, however, equate silence and effective functioning of the school, while pupils just take quiet for granted.

Table 4.6 contains six items concerned with teacher manners, features, and imputed cognitive structure. The bulk of the disparities involve teachers versus pupils and parents versus pupils comparisons.

4.61 Items (266) pleasantly, (145) interested in, (136), courteously, (276) appears interested show higher negative norm usage by parents or pupils than for teachers or school officials. It is very probable these items are not salient for the teachers or school officials. They probably assume pleasantness, courteousness, and interestedness as a regular part of the job, and focus upon other aspects of the school situation. Conversely, perhaps parents and pupils single out these items for making particularistic complaints and there results a considerable number of negative norm disparities of usage.

4.62 Item (143) quietly produces an interesting comparison. There is greater usage for positive norms by pupils than teachers but in this case the expectation shows greater usage by teachers than pupils. Such an inconsistency between positive norm and expectation is not logical. In effect, the implication is that people do not expect what they like or like what they do do not expect. Perhaps the pupil position is really as inconsistent as as is indicated by these comparisons.

4.63 Notice that teachers used as liked feature item (143) well groomed, more than did parents. The pupils tend to agree with the teacher in usage.

TABLE 4.7

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR ITEMS CONCERNED WITH TEACHERS' SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Leisure Activity	PN		13.12**		5.74*	-10.70*	
	NN	-5.35*	-5.27*				
	E		15.34***				
	Com.		23.01***		13.09***		23.74***
Meets	PN						
	NN				4.94***		7.04*
	E			-7.93*			-7.69*
	Com.			-9.82*	7.85*		-12.81**
Leisure Activity and Games	PN		14.81***		6.66**	-9.40*	
	NN						
	E		8.69**		6.28**		-7.91*
	Com.		18.22***		9.95***		-15.18**
Meets Teachers	PN						
	NN		-6.29*		-4.90**		-11.09**
	E		7.32**		4.52**		-8.11*
	Com.		12.77***		8.96***	-13.88**	

Apparently for teachers being well groomed is more salient than it is for parents or school officials.

Table 4.7 includes four items concerned with some aspect of teachers' social behavior. Again the bulk of disparities involve pupils being compared with other positions.

4.71 Items (234) leisure activity and games and (115) leisure activity generated very similar patterns of disparity. Teachers and parents both used these items more for positive norms and combined cognitions than did pupils. Teachers indicated higher expectational usage than pupils. Notice, however, that parents and pupils both used leisure activity as a disliked behavior more than did teachers. It may be that leisure activities are salient concerns of teachers who place positive value on activities apart from their professional duties, while it is possible that pupils (and perhaps parents) see such behavior as indicative of the teacher "goofing off."

4.72 Pupils used item (241) meets teachers more as a negative norm than did teachers, parents, or school officials, but the expectational usage is reversed for teacher-pupil and parent-pupil comparisons. Is it possible that pupils see themselves in opposition to teachers and feel their meeting (the teachers) would be detrimental to the pupils?

Table 4.8 contains five items that are concerned with teacher task performance. These are routine duties that are a part of the teachers' job. Some of the disparities are intense with the major disparities involving teachers being compared with parents and pupils.

4.81 Teachers used item (110) evaluates as a liked, expected and combined cognition item more than parents or pupils. Teachers also used this item more for positive norms and combined cognitions than did school officials. Evaluation is probably salient for teachers and they tend to reflect this

TABLE 4.8

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR ITEMS CONCERNED WITH TEACHERS' TASK PERFORMANCE

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Enters	PN						
	NN	17.96***	25.23***	18.74**	7.27*		
	E	9.94**	8.86*				
	Com.		31.28***	23.92***	6.69*		
Evaluates	PN	6.75*	9.78**	8.71*	3.02*		
	NN						
	E	9.30*	13.02***				
	Com.	12.49**	17.70***	11.92*	5.20*		
Evaluates Assignments	PN					7.56*	
	NN	11.85**	14.14***			-23.33***	-25.63***
	E				11.50**		
	Com.		18.09**		10.27*	-14.73*	-25.00***
Plans Assignments	PN						
	NN	4.71*	4.68*			-7.07*	-7.01*
	E						
	Com.		11.01**		12.44***	19.04***	
Works Written Matter	PN						
	NN	13.89***	15.23***				
	E		14.32***		7.19**		
	Com.	17.71***	24.63***		6.92*	-13.41*	-20.34***

concern by high usage of the item. The item is not so salient for other positions, and there are necessarily usage disparities.

4.82 Items (109) enters and (273) works written matter generated inconsistent cognitive patterns. For both items teachers used them as disliked behaviors more than parents and pupils but the teachers also show greater expectational usage for these items than parents or pupils. It may be that these items tap an area which includes activities teachers dislike doing but still expect to have to do. A more precise qualification of such items might be valuable because there is the possibility of serious conflict or problems for the teacher where such contradictory cognitions are encountered.

4.83 Items (255) plans assignments and (220) evaluates assignments are used as disliked behaviors more by teachers and school officials than by parents and pupils. This is probably another series of usage disparities generated by differentiated professional and non-professional viewpoints. These are activities that are part of the teaching job that must be done, but are not liked by the professional positions. As such they are no doubt salient items for teachers and school officials. Such considerations are not of much concern for parents or pupils.

Table 4.9 summarizes four unconncected items in which the majority of disparities involve parents versus teachers, pupils, or school officials.

4.91 Parents used item (119) moves about less as a positive norm and expectation than teachers but more as a positive norm and expected cognition than did pupils or school officials. The parents also used this item more as a disliked behavior than did pupils or school officials. It may well be that parents like and expect a school atmosphere in which there is very little moving around, the room is quiet and orderly, and everybody is productively busy.

TABLE 4.9

SIGNIFICANT POSITIONAL DISPARITIES BY COGNITION TYPE FOR MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

Items	Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials
Aware of Rules	PN			-8.40*		-8.53*	-9.18*
	NN		5.70*			-7.42*	-8.53*
	E						
	Com.					-9.60*	-11.74**
Moves About	PN	13.13**			-11.89***	-10.71*	
	NN				11.67***	12.76*	
	E	14.67*		-15.33*	-13.12***	-29.99***	-16.86**
	Com.	22.29***			-21.38***	-34.19***	
Sportsmanship Appearance	PN		8.51*	-15.16*	9.42***	-14.26*	-23.31**
	NN						
	E						
	Com.		13.79***	-16.50**	13.56***	-16.74**	-30.30***
Collects Money	PN						
	NN	5.99*				10.79**	
	E	12.37***	12.59***			-18.98***	-19.20***
	Com.	11.22**	12.17**			-22.30***	-23.26***

4.92 Item (280) collects money is apparently a potential conflict area. Teachers used this as a disliked item more than did parents but parents used it as a negative norm more than did school officials. Evidently the teachers and school officials are in close agreement on the item in relation to negative norms. However, teachers indicated a much higher expectation for collecting money than parents or pupils, and again the school officials also used the item more than did parents or pupils. The professional positions are in sharp usage opposition to the non-professional positions as has been the case for several other items.

4.93 Item(277) Sportsmanship appearance can probably be edited to mean that the teacher appears to be fair in her or his behavior. As such it is held as a positive norm by more teachers than pupils, more school officials than teachers, more parents than pupils. Sportsmanship and fairness must be more salient for school officials than for any other of these positions. It may very well be that this reflects the contacts that school officials frequently have with pupils and parents wherein the issue is that of the teacher being unfair or playing favorites.

4.94 Item (207) aware of rules generated an inconsistent pattern in which the sign of disparity agrees for positive and negative norms. This could very well be random. In any event, it is not logical for parents, pupils, and school officials to disagree that they like and dislike the same thing.

Summary

Four community positions (teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials) have been compared using 153 unique items coded from their voluntered norms and expectations for teacher behavior. Two types of analyses were made of these data.

The first analysis dealt with the proportion of content item usage for each of the four positions. It was discovered that numerous significant differences existed among positions for usage. The majority of these disparities involved pupils in comparison with other positions, while teachers and school officials tended to utilize the same content areas. Various individual findings were also noted.

The second analysis dealt with a scaling of cognitions from the voluntered responses, and results indicated only random significance.

These findings are interpreted for role theory and the role of the teacher in Chapter VIII.

CHAPTER V

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN SCALED COGNITIONS FOR TEACHER BEHAVIOR

Introduction

In this chapter the own and attributed cognitions of the four community positions (teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials) are compared. The data presented in the chapter were generated by Form Four of the Role Study which consisted of a series of questions centering around pre-coded scales dealing with teacher behavior. For each behavioral item, respondents were asked to give 12 responses; their own expectation, positive norm , and negative norm and then to attribute expectations, positive norms, and negative norms to three sentient object positions. The sentient objects chosen were People in General, Teachers, and School Officials. In addition, teacher respondents were asked to indicate their own behavior for each item. (Data for reported teacher behaviors are discussed in Chapter VII.)

Respondents were provided with a five-category scale of alternatives dealing with amount of behavior teachers were likely to (or "should") exhibit. The five response alternatives were:

1. (Teachers do) A great deal of (...the behavior specified...)
2. A lot of
3. A moderate amount of
4. A slight amount of
5. Little or no

For purposes of analysis, scores corresponding to the numbers indicated above were assigned to responses. Thus, a mean (or median) score of 4.5 indicates that the central tendency of responses centered between teachers doing "A great deal" and "A lot" of the behavior specified in the item.

Form Four originally was designed to deal with 50 separate items of teacher behavior. In order to avoid respondent fatigue, the form was issued in five

TABLE 5.1

NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT OWN AND ATTRIBUTED POSITIONAL COGNITIVE DISPARITIES FOR SCALED TEACHER BEHAVIORS

		Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials	Totals
Own	E	9	10	3	4	5	6	37
	PN	12	12	4	9	8	7	52
	NN	9	13	2	14	4	5	47
People in General	E	4	6	4	1	4	5	24
	PN	6	7	4	4	4	8	33
	NN	4	8	2	10	2	6	32
Teach-ers	E	4	5	1	7	5	6	28
	PN	6	11	0	10	6	9	42
	NN	5	7	3	5	3	6	29
School Officials	E	9	9	1	7	5	9	40
	PN	5	9	3	5	6	9	37
	NN	3	10	1	10	4	9	37

sub-forms (Forms IVa through IVe), each of which dealt with only ten items. A single respondent was given only one of the five possible sub-forms to fill out. Due to inclement weather and administrative error, Forms IVd and IVe were administered to only a few comminity respondents. Consequently, data reported in this Chapter (and in Chapters VI and VII) will deal with the thirty items covered in Forms IVa, and IVb and IVc only.

The findings reported in the chapter consist of significant mean differences with significance level computed by means of the Mann-Whitney z_U. No findings are reported unless they were significant at $p<.05$ or less. In interpreting findings a positive sign indicates that the first listed subject position had a 'higher' mean response than did the second. Thus, if teachers scored 3.45 for a selected cognition and behavioral item, while parents scored 2.00 on the same question, the mean difference reported would be +1.45.

In all, 2160 comparisons of scaled responses were made, of which 438 showed significant ($p<.05$) differences between positions. These significant disparities are summarized in Table 5.1. The rest of the tables in the chapter are summaries of various items which share a common content and pattern of significant positional disparities. Not all 30 items are to be found in these tables. Altogether, 72 comparisons were made for each item. If not more than four disparities were significant at $p < .05$> or not more than one at $p < .01$, it was assumed that the item generated only random significance, and the item was deleted.

Tables of Results and Findings

Table 5.1 presents the number of own cognition disparities which were found when positions were compared for teacher behaviors for 30 items. The table also includes attributed cognitions for sentient object others for the same 30 teacher behavioral items.

5.11 There are proportionately more own cognition disparities than disparities attributed to any sentient object group. The greatest numerical difference is between own cognitions (136)and cognitions attributed to people in general (89). The least numerical difference is between own cognitions (136) and cognitions attributed to School Official (114). There are at least two possible explanations for the greater number of own cognitive disparities. (1) When persons give own cognitions for behaviors or anything else, they are well able to specify likes, dislikes, or expectations. Individual differences are reflected in their responses and the opportunities for disparity are great. However, when persons attributed cognitions to others, and particularly to members of positions or positions very unlike their own, they are probably forced to rely on shared stereotypic information. The stereotype is relatively independent of position and there tends to be a considerable consensus of opinion regarding other positions. Therefore, respondents apparently achieved a rather high degree of consensus in attributing cognitions to People in General (that position most like their own) and considerable less consensus in attributing cognitions to School Officials (that position least like their own). (2) As members of positions interact with each other there are undoubtedly unique aspects attached to the interaction process. Intrapositional disparities tend to be reduced as unique patterns establish themselves. Pupils, teachers, and parents all experience different configurations of interaction, but the frameworks of reference are probably very much alike within each position. Needless to say, further research is required in order to determine which of these possibilities is correct, or to indeed determine whether either the interaction or social distance hypothesis is an adequate explanation.

5.12 The majority of disparities, own and attributed, are contained in comparisons which involve the pupil position. Pupils are involved in 278 of the 438 disparities found for some cognition type for own and attributed cognitions. Teacher-pupil comparisons generated the greatest number of disparities (107). This probably is an indication of the lack of sophistication of members of the pupil position. Apparently the latter are least influenced by stereotypes in attributing cognitions and are probably least informed when giving own cognitions.

5.13 Not surprisingly, the fewest number of disparities appear for teacher-school official comparisons for both own and attributed cognitions. Apparently the values and expectations of these two positions are very similar for teacher behaviors. Teachers know what school officials like, dislike, and expect; and the converse of this is also the case. The 28 disparities found between these positions is significantly less than the number found for any other positional comparison.

5.14 Surprisingly low in number are the 56 disparities found for own and attributed cognitions when the positions of parents and school officials are compared. It is probable that the school officials are very aware of the values and expectations of the public as well as of their own position and teachers. They may therefore, be attributing cognitions to other positions that are accurate and acceptable to these positions. This does not imply the behaviors of school officials will also be acceptable to sentient object others.

5.15 It will be found, as we look at the summary tables, that there is a high correlation between own and attributed cognitions. Evidently subjects tended to believe that other positions held similar cognitions to their own.

Table 5.2 displays six behavioral items, dealing in a general fashion, with the"maintenance of order."

5.21 In table 5.2, as well as in all other tables, the sign of positive norms and expectations for own and attributed cognitions is

Table 5.2

Scaled Positional Differences For Maintenance of Order

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 1. --Watching Pupils During Study Period												
T x PA				.447*						-.625**		
T x PU						-.461*	-.565**			-.588**	-.373*	
T x SO					-.629*							
PA x PU			-.963***				-.401**	-.301*				
PA x SO				-.842**								
PU x SO				-.799**	-.566*							
Item 4. --Ignoring Pupils Misbehaving in the Classroom												
T x PA		.493**			.495*							
T x PU				.331*								.735*
T x SO				.680*	.771*				-.621*			
PA x PU		-.826**	.904***						.689*			.729*
PA x SO				.594*							-.498*	
PU x SO									-1.284**			-1.135**
Item 5. --Keeping Pupils Quiet in the Library												
T x PA	-.417**	-.527**								-.427*		
T x PU			-.467*							-.541**		
T x SO												
PA x PU	.406**	.504**	-.648***			-.300**						
PA x SO			.645*									
PU x SO				-.522*		.528**				.530*		
Item 7. --Policing the Halls												
T x PA	-.673**	-.911***	1.272***					-.531*			-.462*	
T x PU								-.833***			-.373*	
T x SO					-1.163***	1.000*						
PA x PU		.731**	-1.561***			-.660**						
PA x SO		.641*			-.766**						.481*	
PU x SO			1.003*		-.826**	1.000**					.392*	1.000*

Table 5.2 (Continued) **

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 19.--Supervising On The Playground												
T x PA		-.863***	.883***									
T x PU						-.715**						
T x SO		-.679*										
PA x PU		.602**	-1.150***		.414*	-.889***		-.479*				-.348*
PA x SO			-.780**									
PU x SO					-.686*			1.152***				
Item 29. --Disciplining Pupils in The Cafeteria												
T x PA	-.812*	-1.103***								-.764*		
T x PU					-1.207**							-1.077*
T x SO												
PA x PU					-.672*							-.785*
PA x SO		.744*										
PU x SO												

Note:

An unsigned mean difference corresponds to greater concern for the frequency of the listed behavioral item by the first position indicated in the comparison and a negative sign corresponds to less concern for the behavioral item listed by the second position indicated in the comparison.

Significances of difference for all tables are indicated by: * = .01 < P < .05, ** = .001 < P < .01, and *** = P < .001.

In Tables 5.2 through 5.7 T = Teachers, PA = Parents, PU = Pupils, SO = School Officials

Table 5.3 **

Scaled Positional Differences for Control of Deviancy

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 12. --Watching for Cheaters During a Classroom Test												
T x PA			.938*							-.428*		
T x PU		-.606*	1.173**									
T x SO											.684*	
PA x PU					-.401*			-.629***			-.347*	
PA x SO		.764*								.768**	.601*	
PU x SO		1.048**						.690*		.909**	.948**	
Item 14. --Telling Misbehaving Students in Classroom to Stop Talking												
T x PA												
T x PU	-.563*							-.599*			-.579**	
T x SO												-1.484*
PA x PU								-.436*				
PA x SO	.708*	.717*	-1.095*					-.766*		.761*	.773*	-1.335**
PU x SO	.974**	.701*						1.202***	-1.391*	.871**	1.026**	-1.548**
Item 24. --Threatening Pupils Misbehaving in the Classroom												
T x PA		-.830*	1.442**			.994*				-.816*	-.610*	.997*
T x PU			1.053*		-.817*	1.135*					-.834*	
T x SO						1.357*				.732*		
PA x PU												
PA x SO		1.380**					1.409**	.916*		1.548**	1.226**	-1.569*
PU x SO		1.032*					1.217*			1.450**	1.450**	-1.412*

in agreement. The correlation between positive norms and expectations has been found throughout the study and has been frequently pointed out. Also, the sign of the negative norm disparities is the reverse of that for positive norms and expectations. This too, has been a general finding throughout the study. This finding will not be mentioned again in this chapter.

5.22 The cell which shows the teacher-school official comparison attributing cognitions to teachers is empty except for the single item Ignoring Pupils Misbehaving in the Classroom. For this item, teachers attribute it to teachers as a slightly less disliked behavior by teachers than do school officials. For the cells which show the teacher-school official comparison attributing cognitions to school officials there are no disparities. This is strong support for finding 5.13 in which it was implied there is a high degree of consensus for these two positions.

5.23 Parent-pupil disparities are frequent for these items, and the disparities are often quite large. In general parents approve of maintenance of order more than do pupils for own cognitions and tend to attribute this greater approval to teachers and school officials. Apparently, parents also approve of maintenance of order more than do teachers. These disparities are probably all due to unique aspects of experience in the interaction that occurs between the positions as was implied in finding 5.11.

5.24 The findings for negative norms are consistent with those for expectations and positive norms. Pupils dislike maintenance of order more than do parents and teachers, but there is some indication that parents expect more maintenance of order than do teachers or pupils.

Table 5.3 summarizes three items concerned with the control of deviancy. There is a consistent pattern in which the major differences show parents and pupils in opposition to teachers and school officials.

5.31 In general, for own and attributed cognitions it appears that parents and pupils approve more of deviancy control than do teachers and school officials. Negative norm findings are consistent and indicate teachers and school officials dislike deviancy control more than do parents and pupils. Also, it would appear the pupils and parents expect to find more deviancy control by teachers than do teachers and school officials.

5.32 The largest number of disparities are found for own cognition comparisons between parents, pupils, and school officials and for attributed cognitions by these same positions to teachers and school officials. The area of deviancy control appears to be highly controversial, but fortunately there appears to be very little conflict between the teachers and school officials.

Table 5.4 displays a series of items concerned with behaviors carried on by the teacher on an individual basis. We have labeled these items as being concerned with teacher self indulgence.

5.41 Again, as in table 5.3, parents and pupils are found in opposition to teachers and school officials. Particularly intense disparities were generated for own and attributed cognitions by the two items, Grading Papers During a Classroom Singing Period and Reading Own Books During Study Period. Parents and pupils like these activities less than do teachers, expect less of the activities than do teachers, and disapprove more of the indicated behavior than do teachers. Parents and pupils also attribute their values and expectations to all sentient object others plus frequently disagreeing with each other. When the parents and pupils do disagree, it is usually the pupils who are indicating greater expectations, less approval, and more disapproval.

5.42 Of particular importance is the general finding for these items that parents and pupils dislike these behaviors but still expect teachers to perform them. This is surely an area that is potentially productive of conflict or the creating of unfavorable images of the teacher by parents and pupils. No doubt parents see the teacher as "goofing off" in areas that teachers and school officials consider as very normal and appropriate activities.

Table 5.5 contains four items dealing with community participation. The majority of disparities involve the teachers in opposition to pupils, parents, and school officials for own cognitions and once again disparities indicate that parents and pupils are quite different than teachers and school officials for attributed cognitions.

5.51 Speaking Out at PTA Meeting is one of the most controversial items which is included in this analysis. (refer to finding 6.73 of Chapter VI. Also, findings 7.71 and 7.72 of Chapter VII.) Parents, pupils and school officials all expect more speaking out at PTA than do teachers. Parents and pupils approve more of teachers speaking out at PTA than do teachers. Teachers dislike speaking out at PTA more than do parents and pupils. The parents and pupils attribute their likes, dislikes, and expectations to all sentient object others for this item.

5.52 However, for attributed cognitions, parents indicate a greater dislike for speaking out at PTA by teachers for school officials than school officials themselves. The same applies to the parent-school official comparison for teachers. Pupils are more or less in agreement with parents in attributed cognitions, but the differences are slightly greater for comparisons involving the pupils. Evidently, parents and pupils would like for teachers to "speak out", expect them

Table 5.4 **

Scaled Positional Differences for Teacher Self Indulgence

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 21. --Reading Own Books During Study Period												
T x PA	-1.127**	-.770*		-.819*	-.955**	.838*	-1.235***	-1.222***	1.334**	-1.031**	-.657*	.956*
T x PU	-1.507***	-1.600***	1.450*	-1.394**	-1.800***	1.806***	-1.615***	-1.772***	1.546**	-1.829***	-1.713***	1.400**
T x SO												
PA x PU		-.830*			-.845*	.968*				.798**	-1.056**	
PA x SO	1.210*	.920*					1.568**	1.180**		1.102**		
PU x SO	1.590**	1.750*	-1.736*	1.561*	1.375*		1.948***	1.730**		1.900***	1.596**	
Item 15. --Doing Own Studying and Grading in The Library												
T x PA	-.625*		1.072*	-1.081***		.985*				-.819*		
T x PU	-.614*			-.672*						-.835*		
T x SO				-1.156*								
PA x PU			-.628*			-.489*						-.533*
PA x SO	.947**	.738*	-1.310*		.830*			.702*	-1.362**	.954*	.919*	-1.334**
PU x SO	.936**				.929*	-1.313**			-1.373**		.984**	
Item 23. --Grading Papers During a Classroom Singing Period												
T x PA	-.873*				-.666*		-1.106**	-.776**		-.734**		.796*
T x PU	-1.127*	-.948**	1.340*		-.851*	1.414*	-1.116**	-1.063**	1.500**	-1.300***	-.825*	1.383**
T x SO												
PA x PU						.904*			.904*	-.566*		
PA x SO				1.191*			1.106*	.976**		.734*		
PU x SO	1.210*	1.081*		1.189*				1.263**		1.300**	1.025*	
Item 11. --Visiting With Other Teachers During Study Period												
T x PA								-.521*	1.078*	-.437*		
T x PU	-.667***	-.504*			-.686**			-.622*		-.545**		
T x SO												
PA x PU												
PA x SO		.577*										
PU x SO		.600*								.608*		

Table 5.4 (Continued)

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 9. --Visiting With Other Teachers on the Playground												
T x PA	-.467††	-.481†										
T x PU			1.164††		-.681†	1.250†††				-.637†		1.140††
T x SO												
PA x PU			.872††			.776††						.668†
PA x SO												
PU x SO			-1.593††			-1.412††						
Item 3. --Singing During a Classroom Singing Period												
T x PA			.769†									
T x PU												-.773††
T x SO					-.544†							
PA x PU			-.724††			-.686††						
PA x SO					-.348†							
PU x SO				-.725†	-.640†							
Item 22. --Leaving The Room During a Classroom Test												
T x PA				-.468†								
T x PU	-.461†	-.731†		-.487†		.790†			.863†			.764†
T x SO				-.333†					.288†			
PA x PU		-.493†									-.471††	
PA x SO												
PU x SO												

Table 5.5 **

Scaled Positional Differences for Community Participation

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
__Item 6.__ --Speaking Out at PTA Meeting in The Auditorium												
T x PA	-1.263^{***}	$-.798^{***}$	1.376^{***}		$-.667^{*}$	1.281^{**}	$-.783^{**}$	$-.695^{**}$	$.848^{*}$			$.881^{*}$
T x PU	-1.128^{**}	$-.732^{**}$	1.088^{*}	$-.664^{*}$	$-.807^{**}$	1.271^{**}	-1.303^{***}	-1.134^{**}	1.464^{**}	$-.686^{**}$	$-.663^{*}$	1.113^{*}
T x SO	$-.739^{*}$											
PA x PU							$-.420^{*}$	$-.453^{*}$		$-.394^{*}$		
PA x SO	$.324^{*}$					-2.046^{**}	$.718^{*}$	$.871^{**}$	-1.721^{**}			-1.309^{**}
PU x SO						-2.035^{***}	1.138^{***}	1.327^{**}	-2.337^{***}	$.853^{**}$	$.818^{*}$	-41.384^{**}
__Item 16.__ --Attending PTA Meetings in Auditorium												
T x PA		$-.480^{*}$										
T x PU		$-.837^{***}$						$-.887^{***}$				
T x SO		$-.854^{**}$							-1.546^{*}			
PA x PU		$-.379^{**}$	$-.241^{*}$			$-.313^{*}$	$-.603^{***}$	$-.994^{**}$	$.810^{*}$	$-.294^{*}$	$-.280^{*}$	$-.297^{*}$
PA x SO						$-.654^{*}$			-1.383^{**}			
PU x SO					$.824^{***}$		1.087^{***}	1.491^{***}	-2.175^{***}			$.443^{*}$
__Item 26.__ --Visiting With Parents During PTA Meeting in the Auditorium												
T x PA			1.223^{*}									
T x PU												
T x SO		-1.341^{*}	1.857^{*}									
PA x PU	$-.674^{*}$						$-.543^{*}$					
PA x SO												
PU x SO												
__Item 30.__ --Participating In Community Activities Out of School												
T x PA			1.126^{*}		$.711^{**}$						$.623^{*}$	
T x PU								$-.394^{*}$				
T x SO											$.660^{*}$	
PA x PU	$-.550^{*}$	$-.778^{**}$					$-.848^{**}$	$-.920^{***}$		$-.311^{*}$		
PA x SO												
PU x SO								$.844^{*}$				

to "speak out", dislike for them not to "speak out", but also believe such behavior would be disapproved by school officials.

5.53 The same general pattern holds for Attending PTA Meetings with special emphasis on positive norm disparities. Parents, pupils, and school officials like teacher attendance at PTA meetings more than do teachers.

Table 5.6 summarizes two items concerned with teacher cooperation. The most differences are found between teachers and pupils and the greatest degree of difference is found between parents and pupils.

5.61 Possibly significant is the fact that for these items there is only one minor difference for own and attributed cognitions when teachers and parents are compared. This may be an area where the parent stereotype for the teacher position is quite favorable.

5.62 The disparities which appear as a result of pupils being compared with teachers and parents indicates that even though pupils' cognitions tend to be like those of parents there are surely areas of great difference between parents and pupils as well as between pupils and all other positions.

5.63 Interesting also is the finding that shows teachers as expecting more teacher cooperation with the principal than do either pupils or school officials.

Table 5.7 contains five miscellaneous behavior items. The patterns of difference vary from item to item, but as usual, most of differences involve the pupils in comparison with teachers, parents, or school officials.

5.71 It is not surpising to find that teachers, parents, and school officials expect more supervising of pupils than do pupils themselves. Also pupils dislike this behavior more than do the other positions. The pupils also attribute their own cognitions to others.

Table 5.6 **

Scaled Positional Differences for Teacher Cooperation

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 10. --Cooperating With Other Teachers in the School												
T x PA												
T x FU			-.339*						-.348*		.362*	
T x SO												
PA x FU			-.271*						-.332*	.291*	.292*	-.237*
PA x SO												
FU x SO												
Item 20. --Cooperating With the Principal in School												
T x PA								.508*				
T x FU	.387**	.358**	-.672**									-.348*
T x SO	.278*			.458*			.600**	.578*				
PA x FU			-.990***			-.353*						-.840***
PA x SO				.324*			.453*					
FU x SO			.893*									.701*

Table 5.7 **

Scaled Positional Differences for Miscellaneous Items

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 2. --Supervising Pupils in a Classroom Test												
T x PA					.637*				-.692*			
T x PU	.688*		-.984**	.881**		-.824**			-1.234**			-.969**
T x SO					-.623*							
PA x PU	.688**	.613*	-.928***	.473*		-.497*				.709**		-.639*
PA x SO				-.583*	-.908**							
PU x SO	-1.133**		1.149**	-1.036***	-1.280***	.728*	-.830*		1.203*	-.973*		
Item 8. --Disciplining Pupils During Basketball Game in the Gym												
T x PA	-.376*	-.376*	1.133**								-.734**	
T x PU	-.917***	-.831**			-.698*		-1.013***	-.987***		-.633*	-1.026***	
T x SO												
PA x PU			-.768*				-.899***	-.888***				
PA x SO												
PU x SO		.628*					1.331***	.743*		.813**	.812**	
Item 13. --Having Pupils Sing Solos During a Classroom Singing Period												
T x PA												
T x PU			.814*						.912*			
T x SO												
PA x PU	.337*											.763*
PA x SO												
PU x SO												-1.210*
Item 17. --Allowing Pupils to Explore During Experiments in the Laboratory												
T x PA			.673*				-.491*					
T x PU		-.696**										
T x SO	-.744*	-.682*									-.577*	
PA x PU		-.533**										
PA x SO												
PU x SO												1.192**

Table 5.7 (Continued)

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 28. —Doing Menial Tasks During Basketball Games in the Gym												
T x PA		_	.931†									
T x PU		-.912†	1.568††					-1.019††				
T x SO			.429†									
PA x PU								-.695††	1.004†			
PA x SO												
PU x SO												

5.72 An interesting set of disparities shows that for pupil supervision teachers think people in general like this behavior more than do parents, school officials believe people in general like this behavior more than teachers and school officials attribute a greater liking for more teacher supervision of pupils than do parents. There appears to be some real confusion among the positions for this item.

5.73 For Disciplining Students During a Basketball Game the teacher expectations are less than those of parents or pupils and they also indicate they like this behavior less than do parents plus indicating a strong greater dislike for the behavior than do parents. It is very likely that teachers do not see such behavior as a part of their professional activities while parents probably see teachers as supervisors or disciplinarians wherever they might be.

5.74 The teachers indicate a greater dislike for having pupils sing solo than do pupils. They also believe that other teachers dislike this behavior more than pupils believe it is disliked by teachers.

5.75 Experimenting in the Laboratory is liked more by teachers than pupils or school officials. Possibly the school officials see this as dangerous for pupils and indicate they do not expect such behavior as much as do teachers.

5.76 Doing Menial Tasks is indicated as a disliked behavior by teachers more than by parents, pupils, or school officials. Again, it is very possible that the teacher sees the professional aspects of teaching and dislikes things which can be considered as non-professional As in finding 5.73, parents probably see the teachers' job as including many activities which teachers would consider as inappropriate or even demeaning.

Summary

Four positions have been compared for own and attributed cognitions for specified teacher behaviors. Proportionally more own cognition disparities were found than disparities attributed to sentient object others. The majority of disparities involved pupils when compared to other positions. Maintenance of order items, community participation items, and self indulgence items tended to generate more and greater disparities between the positions for both own and attributed cognitions. The implications of these findings for role theory and the teacher role will be stated in Chapter VIII.

CHAPTER VI

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN ACCURACY

Introduction

In this chapter four respondent positions (teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials) are compared for the accuracy of norms and expectations which they attribute to two sentient object positions (Teachers and School Officials). Accuracy of an attributed cognition may be briefly defined as the degree to which a cognition attributed to a sentient object corresponds with the actual first-order cognition which it purports to model.

The data analysed in this chapter were drawn from Form Four. As they were drawn from the same basic responses reported in Chapters V and VII, the findings reported here are somewhat redundant. However, it will be noted that some findings of this chapter are distinct from those of Chapters V and VII. Consequently, it was felt desirable to report these data despite occasional repitition.

As in the previous chapter, findings were drawn from the thirty items of forms IV a, IV b and IV c, and are reported as mean differences with significance level computed by means of the Mann-Whitney z_U. No findings are reported unless they were significant at $p < .05$ or less. In Table 6.1 all statistically significant differences are tabulated. In Tables 6.2 through 6.9 only those content items which appeared to generate results which were unexpected in terms of chance variation were included. Thus, if out of 24 comparisons made per item not more than one was significant at $p < .05$ the item was not reported.

Taken as a whole, the results indicate differences considerably beyond chance variation. Out of 720 comparisons examined, 146 were significant at $p < .05$ while a large number of these were also significant at $p < .01$ or $p < .001$. In addition, the significant differences tended to 'gang up' on approximately two-thirds of the 30 items used. Apparently these latter items were more

Table 6.1

Number of Significant Differences Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position								
	Teachers			Teacher Total	School Officials			School Officials Total	Grand Total
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm		Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm		
Teachers	1	1	3	5	3	3	3	9	14
Parents	7	12	8	27	8	10	3	21	48
Pupils	10	15	14	39	11	11	10	32	71
School Officials	4	3	5	12	0	0	1	1	13
Totals	22	31	30	83	22	24	17	63	146

Totals by type of cognition: E = 44, Positive N = 55, Negative N = 47 fruitful for generating disparities between attributed and actual cognitions than were the others.

Results

Results are reported in both a summary table and in separate tables dealing with selected content fields of teacher behavior.

Table 6.1 reports the number of significant differences between cognitions attributed by subject positions to sentient objects and the actual cognitions reported by those sentient object positions. It should be recalled that up to thirty significant differences might have occurred in each cell of the table. Thus, it can be seen that in 15 out of 30 items (50%), pupils attributed to Teachers positive norms which were significantly different from norms actually held by Teachers. Findings from this table include the following:

6.11 The data indice wide-spread differences between the cognitions attributed to and those actually held by Teachers and School Officials.

6.12 School officials and teachers rarely misjudged the cognitions of their own positions.

6.13 Next to these two groups, parents stood midway in ability to estimate accurately the cognitions of Teachers and School Officials, while pupils were least accurate in their attributions.

6.14 The cognitions of School Officials were less often misjudged than those of Teachers (except by teacher respondents).

6.15 There was some tendency for respondents to misjudge positive norms (N=55) more than either expectations (N=44) or negative norms (N=47).

Table 6.2 reports a set of five items which deal with teacher self-indulgence and which exhibit a similar pattern of significant differences

Table 6.2

Significant Mean Differences Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Teacher Self Indulgence

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 11. --Visiting with Other Teachers During Study						
Teachers	.64***	.48*	--	--	--	--
Parents	.88***	1.00***	-1.43***	--	--	--
Pupils	1.00***	1.11***	-1.11**	--	.63*	--
School Officials	1.17***	.94**	-1.28**	--	--	--
Item 21. --Reading Own Books During Study Period						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	1.15**	1.15***	-1.05*	--	--	--
Pupils	1.53***	1.70***	-1.26*	.57*	1.59**	-1.40*
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--
Item 23. --Grading Papers During Class Singing Period						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	1.19**	.84**	--	--	--	--
Pupils	1.20**	1.13**	-1.43**	1.30*	1.02*	--
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--
Item 22. --Leaving the Room During a Classroom Test						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	.50*	.33*	--	--	--	--
Pupils	.42*	.58*	--	--	--	--
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--
Item 9. --Visiting with other Teachers on Playground						
Teachers	--	--	-1.40**	--	-.50*	--
Parents	--	.54**	-1.16**	--	--	--
Pupils	--	.78**	-1.64***	--	--	-1.30**
School Officials	--	.71*	-1.22*	--		

Note: * = $.01 < p < .05$, ** = $.001 < p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$.

between attributed and actual cognitions. Findings of this table include:

6.21 Respondents attributed to Teachers' expectations and desires for greater self-indulgence than teachers actually expected or wanted. In general, these attributed errors were not made when the sentient object was the School Official.

6.22 The least accurate subjects were pupils, followed by parents. With the exception of Item 11 - Visiting with Other Teachers During a Study Period (for which school officials misjudged teacher cognitions), teacher and school official subjects appeared to be relatively accurate in the cognitions they attributed for teacher self-indulgence.

Table 6.3 presents a set of four items concerned with teacher supervision of pupils and the maintenance of order. In all cases the items involved are neutral in tone, both with regard to the public morality of the school and in terms of teacher intrusion into the social space of the pupil. In Table 6.3 the teacher is seen as representing the control forces of an impersonal institution, and it may be assumed that school officials and teachers are equally concerned about these issues. Findings include the following:

6.31 Parents overestimate the desires of Teachers and both the desires and expectations of School Officials for maintenance of order by teachers.

6.32 Pupils overestimate both the desires and expectations of Teachers and School Officials for teacher maintenance of order.

6.33 Despite these prior findings, parents and pupils are accurate in their estimates of negative norms held by School Officials. (They are not accurate in negative norms attributed to Teachers).

Table 6.4 displays a single item which differs from those of Table 6.3 in that the teacher is seen as threatening pupils. Although still neutral in terms

Table 6.3

Significant Mean Differences Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for The Maintenance of Order

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 7. --Policing the Halls						
Teachers	—	—	—	—	—	—
Parents	—	.60*	-.29*	.60**	.29**	—
Pupils	.62*	.90***	-.99*	.32*	.20**	—
School Officials	—	—	—	—	—	-.94*
Item 8. --Disciplining During Basketball Game in Gym						
Teachers	—	—	—	—	—	—
Parents	—	.32*	-1.02*	.70**	.34*	—
Pupils	1.11***	1.21***	-1.11*	1.10**	1.05***	—
School Officials	—	—	—	—	—	—
Item 1. --Watching Pupils During Study Period						
Teachers	—	—	-.79*	—	—	—
Parents	—	—	—	.62**	.53*	—
Pupils	.88***	—	—	.59*	.59*	—
School Officials	—	—	—	—	—	—
Item 19. --Supervising on Playground						
Teachers	—	—	—	—	—	—
Parents	—	—	—	—	.80**	—
Pupils	—	.72**	—	—	—	—
School Officials	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note: * = .01 < p < .05, ** = .001 < p < .01, *** = p < .001.

Table 6.4

Significant Mean Differences Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Threatening Pupils

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 24. --Threatening Pupils Misbehaving in Class						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	--	.07**	-1.50**	1.17*	1.22**	--
Pupils	--	--	-1.37**	1.07*	1.45**	--
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 6.5

Significant Mean Differences Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Controlling Pupil Behavior

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 12. --Watching for Cheaters During Classroom Test						
Teachers	--	--	-1.41**	.01**	1.20**	-1.40**
Parents	--	--	-1.03*	1.10***	1.11**	-1.30**
Pupils	--	--	-1.40***	1.24***	1.46***	-1.62***
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--
Item 14. --Telling Misbehaving Pupils in Classroom to Stop Talking						
Teachers	--	--	--	.01*	--	-1.54**
Parents	.40*	.43*	--	.90**	.90**	-1.40**
Pupils	.47*	.06***	--	1.09**	1.15***	-1.51**
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--
Item 25. --Choosing Books for Pupils in the Classroom						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	-2.15*
Parents	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pupils	--	--	-1.43*	--	--	-2.22**
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: * = $.01 < p < .05$, ** = $.001 < p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

of the public morality of the school, this item involves direct teacher intrusion into the social space of the pupil. With one exception, findings from this table are similar to those of Table 6.3.

6.41 Parents *overestimate* the desires of Teachers and both the desires and expectations of School Officials for threatening of pupils by teachers.

6.42 Pupils *overestimate* the desires of Teachers and both the desires and expectations of School Officials for threatening of pupils by teachers. (Pupils do *not*, however, overestimate Teacher expectations for threats.)

6.43 Despite these prior findings, parents and pupils are again *accurate* in their estimates of negative norms held by School Officials.

Table 6.5 consists of three items which are, again, somewhat distinct from those of either Table 6.3 or 6.4. These items, which are concerned with *controlling pupil behavior*, may be assumed to be 'loaded' in terms of the public morality of the school. As can be seen, for these items, teachers as subjects are also inaccurate in cognitions attributed to School Officials.

6.51 Teachers, parents, and pupils all overestimate the desires and expectations of School Officials for the controlling of pupil behavior in critical areas of institutional morality. (School officials do not.)

6.52 Teachers, parents, and pupils all overestimate the desires of Teachers for the controlling of pupil behavior in critical areas of institutional morality. (School officials do not.)

6.53 In the area of teacher telling misbehaving pupils to stop talking (only), parents and pupils also overestimate the expectations of Teachers.

Table 6.6 is composed of a single item which deals with the use of force by the teacher. '*Having*' *Pupils Sing* may be interpreted by pupils as 'forcing' pupils, and indeed the single finding significant at $p < .01$ in Table 6.6 supports such an interpretation.

6.61 Pupils underestimate the degree to which Teachers disapprove of forcing pupils to sing.

Table 6.7 displays three items which are concerned with teacher *cooperation and participation*. The items are alike in that they deal with teacher interaction with other positions than pupils. Findings include:

6.71 Parents, pupils and school officials *underestimate* the amount of cooperation with Principal desired and expected by Teachers, while teachers and parents *overestimate* the amount expected by School Officials.

6.72 School officials *underestimate* the amount of attendance at PTA desired and expected by Teachers, while pupils *overestimate* the amount desired by Teachers and the amount desired and expected by School Officials.

6.73 Both parents and pupils *overestimate* the amount of speaking out at PTA desired and expected by Teachers.

Table 6.8 shows a single item dealing with *studying and grading* by the teacher in the library. For some reason, both parents and pupils see School Officials as favoring such teacher behavior.

6.81 Parents and pupils overestimate both the approval and expectations of School Officials for studying and grading in the library by teachers.

Table 6.9 consists of a single item dealing with the performance of *menial tasks* during basketball games. In this table, $p < .01$ findings are confined to the pupil.

6.91 Pupils overestimate the desires of Teachers for doing menial

Table 6.6

Significant Mean Difference Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Making Pupils Sing

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 13. --Having Pupils Sing Solos During Classroom Sing						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	.60*	--
Parents	--	--	--	--	.63*	--
Pupils	--	--	-1.16**	--	--	--
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 6.7

Significant Mean Difference Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Cooperation and Participation

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 20. --Cooperating with the Principal in School						
Teachers	--	--	--	.43**	--	--
Parents	- .23*	- .60*	--	.32**	--	--
Pupils	- .43*	- .35*	--	--	--	--
School Officials	- .68***	- .67***	--	--	--	--
Item 16. --Attending PTA Meetings in the Auditorium						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	--	--	--	--	--	--
Pupils	--	1.06***	--	.41*	.39*	--
School Officials	- .78*	--	1.77**	--	--	--
Item 6. --Speaking out at PTA Meeting in the Auditorium						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	1.06***	.51*	--	--	--	--
Pupils	1.48***	.96***	-1.36**	.80**	--	--
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--

Note: * = $.01 < p < .05$, ** = $.001 < p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$

Table 6.8

Significant Mean Difference Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Studying and Grading

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 15. --Doing Own Studying and Grading in Library						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	--	--	--	1.23***	1.05**	-1.56**
Pupils	--	.33*	--	1.03**	1.10**	--
School Officials	--	--	--	--	--	--

* * * * * * * * * * *

Table 6.9

Significant Mean Difference Between Attributed and Actual Cognitions for Doing Menial Tasks

Subject Position	Sentient Object Position					
	Teacher			School Official		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 28. --Doing Menial Tasks During Basketball Game in Gym						
Teachers	--	--	--	--	--	--
Parents	--	--	-.91*	--	--	--
Pupils	--	1.02**	-1.38**	--	--	-1.34*
School Officials	--	--	-.43*	--	--	--

Note: * = .01 < p < .05, ** = .001 < p < .01, *** = p < .001

tasks during basketball games in the gym. (Parents and school officials tend to underestimate the desires of Teachers for avoiding such tasks.)

Summary of Results

Findings are here summarized as they apply to each subject position. Additional summaries may be found in Chapter VIII.

Teachers as Subjects. Teachers rarely misjudge the cognitions of other Teachers. When this occurs it is in connection with self indulgence (6.21) and controlling pupil behavior (6.52). It is also rare for teachers to misjudge the cognitions of School Officials; and when this occurs it is in connection with control of pupils (6.51), and teacher-principal cooperation (6.71).

Parents as Respondents. Parents frequently misjudge the cognitions of both Teachers and School Officials, but more of the norms of Teachers are misjudged than the latter. Parents are inclined to see Teachers as desiring self indulgence (6.21), the maintenance of order (6.31), threats directed towards pupils (6.41), controlling pupils behavior (6.51), and as disinterested in cooperation with the principal (6.71). In contrast, parents more often misjudge the expectations of School Officials than Parents, seeing School Officials as both autocratic and autistic in their judgements about teacher behavior. There is some tendency for parental misjudgements about Teacher and School Official cognitions to be correlated.

Pupils as Respondents. Pupils misjudge the cognitions of both Teachers and School Officials more than any other position of subjects. (Every item included in the analysis contains at least one significant misjudgement by pupils.) Pupil misjudgements are similar to those of parents, only they tend to be numerically greater. Pupils particularly overestimate the amount of control and discipline that School Officials and Teachers expect and want.

School Officials as Respondents. School Officials are the most accurate subject position rarely misjudging the cognitions of Teachers and never (with one exception at $p < .05$) those of School Officials. School official misjudgements about Teacher cognitions occur in connection with teacher visiting (6.22) or about cooperation with the principal (6.72).

Commentary

There are two hypothetical explanations for findings of disparities between cognitions attributed to and those actually reported by Teachers and School Officials.

(1) Differences may indicate that respondents are misinformed about the actually held cognitions of sentient object others.

(2) Differences may arise because the sentient object others (teacher and school official subjects) give acceptable answers to role measuring instruments rather than an honest estimate of the cognitions they hold.

The second of these alternatives implies that teacher and school official respondents are both hypocritical and expedient in filling out questionnaires, and upon these grounds alone we would be inclined to reject it. In addition, some of the data suggest that the first alternative is the more reasonable. Those who are socially 'close' to a sentient object position (teachers and school officials) are more likely to be accurate in attributions made to that position, while age is positively correlated with accuracy of attributed cognitions.

Should the first explanation be accepted, it is evident that there is a good deal of misinformation about the likes, dislikes and expectations of Teachers and School Officials, particularly among parent and pupil respondents. The existence of such inaccuracies implies both a strain in the social system of the school and the existence of institutional structures resulting from and supporting the inaccuracies. These implications will be discussed in Chapter VIII.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

CHAPTER VII

POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES IN VERIDICALITY

Introduction

In this chapter the four respondent positions (teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials) are compared for the veridicality of both own and attributed cognitions which they hold. Veridicality may be defined as the degree to which own or attributed cognitions accurately map actual behaviors. In filling out Form Four, teacher respondents were asked to indicate the amount of activity which most closely matched their actual behavior for each item. To the extent that such reports of behavior given by teachers may be taken as a true indication of actual teacher behavior, cognitions for teacher behavior may be compared with these reports to give a measure of veridicality. Comparisons reported in this chapter, then, consist of mean differences between cognitions held by four groups of subjects and mean behaviors indicated by teachers. Veridicality is reported for subject held (Own) cognitions and for cognitions attributed to People in General, Teachers, and School Officials.

The data analyzed in this chapter were drawn from Form Four, and are thus somewhat redundent in comparison with Chapters V and VI. Once again, it will be noted that some of the findings of this chapter are distinct from those of Chapters V and VI, and once again it was felt desirable to report these data despite occasional redundancy.

As in the two previous chapters, findings were drawn from the thirty items of Forms IVa, IVb and IVc and are reported as mean differences with significance level computed by means of the Mann Whitney z_U. No findings are reported unless they were significant at $p < .05$ or less. In Table 7.1 all statistically significant differences are tabulated. In Tables 7.2 through 7.7 only those content items which appeared to generate results which were unexpected in terms of chance variation were included. (Excluded were four items showing none, one, two,

Table 7.1a

Numbers of Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials			Totals
	Expectation	Positive Norms	Negative Norms	Expectation	Positive Norms	Negative Norms	Expectation	Positive Norms	Negative Norms	Expectation	Positive Norms	Negative Norms	
Teachers	0	1	19	6	3	21	1	0	20	6	7	23	107
Parents	3	4	23	8	8	23	5	8	20	14	12	25	153
Pupils	9	5	17	11	11	19	9	10	20	12	12	19	154
School Officials	0	2	20	14	11	22	3	4	18	3	2	22	121
Totals	12	12	79	39	33	85	18	22	78	35	33	89	535

Table 7.1b

Totals by Type of Cognition

	Expectations	Positive Norms	Negative Norms	Totals
Teachers	13	11	83	107
Parents	30	32	91	153
Pupils	41	38	75	154
School Officials	20	19	82	121
Totals	104	100	331	535

Table 7.1c

Totals by Sentient Object Position

	Own	People in General	Teachers	School Officials	Totals
Teachers	20	30	21	36	107
Parents	30	39	33	51	153
Pupils	31	41	39	43	154
School Officials	22	47	25	27	121
Totals	103	157	118	157	535

and three differences significant at $p < .05$ respectively.)

Taken as a whole, the results indicate differences greatly beyond chance variation. Out of 1440 comparisons made, 535 were significant at $p < .05$, while (as will be seen) many of the differences were also significant at smaller levels of probability. In part, these many significant differences reflect the fact that comparisons were made between negative norms and indicated teacher behavior. (Who would predict teacher behavior to conform to what respondents wanted least?) But, as will be seen, large numbers of significant differences were also found involving expectations and positive norms.

Results

Table 7.1 summarizes all significant differences found between cognitions and indicated teacher behavior. It is broken into a general table (7.1a) and two summary tables drawn from the general table (7.1b and 7.1c). Findings include the following:

7.11 Indicated behaviors were less often different from expectations or positive norms than they were from negative norms. (Teachers tended to behave as others expected or wanted them to behave rather than as others disliked them behaving.)

7.12 Indicated behaviors less often differed from own cognitions, infrequently differed from cognitions attributed to Teachers, and most often differed from cognitions attributed to School Officials. (Whereas Teachers were seen by respondents as holding veridical cognitions, School Officials were seen as holding discordant norms and mistaken expectations.)

7.13 School official subjects (alone) did not share the view indicated in 7.12. In fact, school officials attributed to other School Officials cognitions which were nearly as veridical as those they themselves held.

3

7.14 In contrast with 7.12, the own expectations of teacher and school official respondents never differed significantly from reported teacher behaviors. (Teachers and school officials held expectations of striking veridicality.)

7.15 Of all twelve cognitive types, own expectations least often differed significantly from indicated teacher behavior for all subject positions except pupils. Pupil own positive norms were a better predictor of reported teacher behaviors, while own expectations came second.

7.16 Taking all types of cognitions together, teachers were most veridical in cognitions held, followed by school officials, parents and pupils in that order. The same ordering holds for own and attributed cognitions and for several other breakdowns of the data.

7.17 Negative norms attributed to Teachers less often differed from reported teacher behaviors than the negative norms attributed to any other sentient object, in spite of the fact that expectations and positive norms attributed to Teachers also tended to be similar to reported teacher behaviors.

7.18 Of all reported comparisons, reported behaviors were least like parental dislikes; reported behaviors were most like expectations held by teachers or school officials and (interestingly) norms attributed by teachers to other Teachers.

The findings above do not, by any means, exhaust the relationships to be found in Table 7.1. Other findings will occur to the careful reader. In order to interpret the hundreds of significant comparisons summarized in this table, summary tables have been prepared lumping together items exhibiting similar contents and patterns of significant differences. In Tables 7.2 through 7.7 signed mean differences are reported. A minus sign in these tables signifies that the indicated teacher behavior is less than the cognition held, while an unsigned (+) mean difference signifies that the reported behavior was numerically greater.

In interpreting Tables 7.2 through 7.7 it should be recalled that reported teacher behavior, positive norm, negative norm and expectation all are given on a single five point, rank-ordered, scale of behavioral alternatives. As is revealed in Chapter V, positive norms and expectations tend to be roughly coincidental while negative norms tend to reflect scalar extremes. These facts suggest a convenient typology of possible results:

Type 1 - Reported behavior lies between positive norm (and/or expectation) and negative norm. We would judge the appearance of Type 1 findings if differences appeared showing one sign for expectation (and/or positive norm) and a reversed sign for negative norm.

Type 2 - Reported behavior coincides with positive norm (and/or expectation). Type 2 yields significant differences for only negative norm comparisons, while the sign of the difference indicates only whether the negative norm is above or below the positive norm (and/or expectation) in scalar position.

Type 3 - Reported behavior coincides with negative norm. With Type 3 findings, significance would be yielded for only positive norm (and/or expectation) comparisons.

Type 4 - Reported behavior exceeds the negative norm. If the size of mean difference indicated for negative norm comparison is smaller than those for positive norm (and/or expectation), and all comparisons show the same sign, a Type 4 finding is indicated. In Type 4 the reported teacher behavior is even more extreme than the negative norm given. (No Type 4 results were found in the data.)

Type 5 - Reported behavior exceeds the positive norm (and/or expectation). Type 5 is indicated when all differences show the same sign and the mean difference for positive norm (and/or expectation) is smaller than that for negative norm. In Type 5 the reported teacher behavior is even more extreme than the positive norm (and/or expectation) given.

Table 7.2

Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Maintenance Functions

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 2. --Supervising Pupils in a Classroom Test												
Teachers			2.64***			2.91***			2.84***			1.91***
Parents			1.59***			2.50***			2.15***			2.58***
Pupils	.87*		1.66***			2.00***			1.60**			1.94***
School Officials			2.81***	-4.8*	-7.8**	2.81***			2.81***			2.81***
Item 4. --Ignoring Pupil Misbehavior In A Classroom												
Teachers			-2.11***			-1.80**			-2.29***			-2.51***
Parents			-2.49***			-2.19***			-2.31***	.43*	.47*	-2.50***
Pupils			-1.59**	.39*		-1.81***			-1.62**			-1.77***
School Officials			-2.91***	.74**	.56*	-2.67***			-2.91***			-2.91***
Item 5. --Keeping Pupils Quiet In The Library												
Teachers			2.68***			2.64***			2.81***			2.92***
Parents			2.86***	-.38*	-.33*	2.86***			2.80***	-.44*	-.52**	2.91***
Pupils			2.21***			2.56***			2.55***	-.55**	-.32*	2.59***
School Officials			2.86***	-.72**	-.61*	3.09***			3.09***			2.86***
Item 10. --Cooperating With Other Teachers In School												
Teachers			3.59***			3.42***			3.59***		.31*	3.59***
Parents			3.51***			3.51***			3.58***	-.20*	-.24*	3.53***
Pupils			3.25***			3.42***			3.25***			3.30***
School Officials			3.59***			3.59***			3.59***			3.59***
Item 18. --Kibitzing During Basketball Game in Gym												
Teachers			-2.49***			-2.17***			-2.22***			-2.09***
Parents			-2.06***			-1.85***			-2.20***			-2.16***
Pupils			-1.47**			-1.63***			-1.42**			-1.50**
School Officials			-2.16***			-1.50*			-1.83**			-2.48***

Table 7.2 (Continued)

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 22. --Leaving The Room During Classroom Test												
Teachers			-3.86***			-4.00***			-4.00***			-4.00***
Parents			-3.44***			-3.63***			-3.56***			-3.61***
Pupils			-3.00**			-3.21***			-3.14***			-3.24***
School Officials			-3.57**			-3.83**			-3.71***			-3.57***
Item 23. --Grading Papers During Class Singing Period												
Teachers			-3.93***			-3.93***			-4.00***			-4.00***
Parents			-3.32***			-3.41***	-1.27*	-.98*	-3.40***			-3.20***
Pupils			-3.59**			-2.51*			-2.50*	-1.30*		-2.62**
School Officials			-3.75**			-3.83**			-3.57**			-3.71**

Note: In Tables 7.2 through 7.7: * = .01 < p < .05, ** = .001 < p < .01, *** = p < .001.

Assuming some integration of the educational institution, we would expect coincidence between reported teacher behavior and positive norms (and/or expectations). Thus, Types 1 and 2 should predominate in the data. Types 3 and 4 results would indicate that teachers did what they were disapproved of doing, while Type 5 would indicate hyper-conformity. Analysis of the data show that in the majority of instances findings of Types 1 and 2 predominate. As a result, interpretation will focus upon the less frequent occurances of Types 3, 4 and 5 results.

Table 7.2 presents a series of items mainly concerned with the normal maintenance functions which a teacher carries on in day-by-day school work. Practically all of the differences that are found are Type 2 in nature.

7.21 For all items included in Table 7.2, teachers indicated they behaved in ways which were insignificantly different from expectations and positive norms and strikingly different from negative norms.

7.22 The above pattern holds for all respondents and for both own and attributed cognitions. Moreover, there were insignificant distinctions between subject treatment of the three sentient object positions.

Table 7.3 presents four items dealing with teacher-pupil relationships. These items might have been included in Table 7.2 except for differences in response type. Most of the findings were still Type 2, however.

7.31 For most of the items included in Table 7.3, teachers reported that they behave in ways which are insignificantly different from expectations and positive norms and strikingly different from negative norms.

7.32 The above pattern tended to hold for all subject positions and for both own and attributed cognitions. It appeared strongest, however, for own cognitions and for parental respondents.

7.33 For Item 1 - Watching Pupils During Study Period, Type 1 responses appear at three places. Reported teacher behaviors are significantly less than positive norms (and expectations) and negative norms attributed by parents and pupils to School Officials and between reported behaviors

Table 7.3

Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Teacher Pupil Relations

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 1. --Watching Pupils During Study Period												
Teachers			1.61*			2.68***			2.41***			2.55***
Parents			2.15**			2.34***			2.02***	-.61**	-.43*	2.***
Pupils			1.19*			2.22***			2.01***	-.53**	-.49*	2.46***
School Officials			1.97***		-.85**	2.21***			2.27***			2.21***
Item 3. --Singing During A Classroom Singing Period												
Teachers			1.18**			2.20***			1.35**			2.28***
Parents			1.95***			1.96***			1.54***			1.88***
Pupils			1.23***			1.27***			1.27***			1.50***
School Officials			1.48**		-.87*	1.45***			1.17*			1.72***
Item 13. --Having Pupils Sing Solos During Classroom Sing												
Teachers			-2.15***						-1.90***			
Parents			-1.66***			-1.28**			-1.46**			-1.37**
Pupils			-1.33**									
School Officials			-1.53**		-.82*				-1.81**			-1.81**
Item 17. --Allowing Pupils to Explore During Experiments in the Lab												
Teachers												.04*
Parents			.99***									.72*
Pupils		-.66*	.94**									
School Officials						1.12**						1.56***

and positive norms and negative norms attributed by School Officials to People in General.

The finding reported in 7.33 - that of parallel distortions of public opinion by school official (and other) respondents and of school official opinion by non-school official respondents - reoccur in several other tables. Hereafter it is termed the school-official-public stereotype.

7.34 For Item 13 - Having Pupils Sing Solos During Classroom Sing, the finding of 7.31 was retained for only own cognitions and those attributed to Teachers. (Apparently, negative norms attributed to Persons in General and School Officials were more diffuse over this issue.)

7.35 For Item 17 - Allowing Pupils to Explore During Experiments in the Lab, only very weak Type 2 responses appeared, and none whatsoever for cognitions attributed to Teachers.

Table 7.4 displays five items whose major focus is upon deviancy control. These tables are notable for the appearance of a number of Type 1 responses, particularly for attributions to People in General and School Officials and the near-universality of the school-official-public stereotype.

7.41 For issues of deviancy control, respondents tended to attribute Type 1 responses to People in General and School Officials. In both cases, reported teacher behaviors were less than are norms and expectations attributed to the two groups. (Altogether, 15 out of 20 attributions to People in General and 12 out of 20 to School Officials were Type 2. However, no attributions to School Officials by school official respondents were Type 1. Finally, only 2 out of 20 own cognition comparisons and 3 out of 20 attributions to Teachers were Type 1.)

7.42 With the exception of pupil respondents (who attributed Type 1 responses to Teachers paralleling those attributed to School Officials) responses attributed to Teachers tended to be Type 2.

Table 7.4

Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Deviancy Control

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 7. --Policing the Halls												
Teachers						1.26***			.99**	-.54*	-.58*	1.76***
Parents	-.55*	-.78**	1.71***	-.64*	-.67**	1.69***			1.33***	-.78**	-1.04***	1.75***
Pupils					-.61*	1.03***		-.78**	1.42***	-.71**	-.95***	1.49***
School Officials			1.15**	-1.15***	-1.44***	2.09***			1.15**			2.09***
Item 12. --Watching for Cheaters During Classroom Test												
Teachers				-.72*	-.65*	1.57***			1.39***		-.61*	1.75***
Parents			.91*			1.32***			1.01**	-.75**	-.53*	1.68***
Pupils				-.73**	-.77**	1.63***		-.63**	1.45***	-.89***	-.87***	1.91***
School Officials				-.98**	-.83*	1.63***						1.02*
Item 14. --Telling Misbehaving Pupils in the Classroom to Stop Talking												
Teachers				-.92**		1.08**						1.19***
Parents			.75*	-.67*	-.54*	1.32***			.63*	-.56*		1.04***
Pupils	-.45*			-.77**	-.63*	.93**	-.46*	-.72**	1.10***		-.71**	1.25***
School Officials				-.85*		.91*						
Item 19. --Supervising on Playground												
Teachers			1.55***	-.52*	-.60*	2.40***			1.85***	-.74**		2.50***
Parents		-.59*	2.43***		-.83***	2.57***			1.64***	-.65**	-.68**	2.53***
Pupils			1.28**			1.69***			1.82***	-.58*	-0.71**	2.18***
School Officials		1.65**		-.68*	-1.10***	2.30***				-.74*	-.85**	2.43***
Item 24. --Threatening Pupils Who Misbehave In Class												
Teachers			-3.50***			-3.36***			-2.70**			-2.93**
Parents				-1.48*		-2.36*	-1.41*	-1.17*				
Pupils	-1.18*		-2.44*		-1.25*	-2.22*			-2.13*			
School Officials			-3.36**						-3.36**			-3.50**

Table 7.5 consists of a set of six items concerned with teacher self-indulgence. In several of the items of this table we find Type 5 responses, particularly in cognitions attributed to Teachers.

7.51 Teachers reported being even less self-indulgent than they were given credit for wanting or expecting themselves to be by respondents - thus giving rise to Type 5 responses on three out of the six items, four in Table 7.5. (The items involved were 11 - Visiting with Other Teachers During Study Periods, 20 - Cooperating with the Principal in School, and 21 - Reading Own Books During Study Period.) On the other hand, only pupil respondents misjudged reported teacher behaviors for these same items in the positive norms and expectations they held. All other respondents held veridical cognitions.

7.52 With the exceptions taken in 7.51, responses for self-indulgence tended to be Type 2 (for all respondents except pupils) and Type 1 (for pupils) for both own and attributed cognitions. There was little tendency for the school-official-public stereotype to be noted for self-indulgence.

Table 7.6 is composed of two items dealing with PTA and community participation. Of these, only Item 16 - Attending PTA Meetings in the Auditorium tends to generate significance and differences between reported teacher behaviors and cognitions.

7.61 Teacher and parental respondents were veridical in the positive norms and expectations they held for attendance at PTA meetings and for cognitions attributed to Teachers. They tended, however, to feel that People in General and School Officials both expected and wanted more attendance than teachers actually reported.

7.62 Pupils responded similarly to teachers and parents, except that they extended positive and negative norm distortion to Teachers (in addition to People in General and School Officials).

Table 7.5

Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Self-Indulgence

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 8. --Disciplining During Basketball Game In Gym												
Teachers												
Parents		-.66*	.45*		-.95**	.39*		-.61*		-.76*	-1.05**	.56**
Pupils	-.76*	-.93**		-1.01**	-1.00**		-.96**	-1.20**	.43*	-1.14***	-1.36***	
School Officials				-.96*								
Item 9. --Visiting With Other Teachers on Playground												
Teachers			-1.92***			-2.42***				.60*	.50*	-2.19***
Parents			-1.63***			-1.01***						-1.72***
Pupils						-1.12*						-1.05*
School Officials			-2.35***			-2.33***						-2.12***
Item 11. --Visiting With Other Teachers During Study Periods												
Teachers			-3.22***			-3.32***	-.47*		-2.07***			-2.96***
Parents			-2.70***			-2.74***	-.71**	-.95***	-1.79***			-2.98***
Pupils	-.50*		-2.74***	-.60*	-.61*	-2.72***	-.83**	-1.05***	-2.12***			-2.80***
School Officials			-3.06***	-1.00*		-3.20***	-1.00**	-.89**	-1.94**			-2.94***
Item 15. --Doing Own Studying and Grading In The Library												
Teachers												
Parents				-1.10**	-1.04**	.64**		-.76*		-1.13**	-1.05***	.66**
Pupils				-.69*	-1.14**		-.71*	-1.01**		-.94**	-1.19***	
School Officials				-1.17**					-1.56**			
Item 20. --Cooperating With the Principal In School												
Teachers			3.40***			3.64***			3.57***			3.70***
Parents			3.72***			3.65***		.66*	3.20***			3.79***
Pupils	.30*		2.73***			3.33***	.35*		3.04***			3.15***
School Officials			3.63***	.41*		3.57***	.70**	.63**	3.41***			3.05***

Table 7.5 (Continued)

	Own			People In General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 21. --Reading Own Books During Study Period												
Teachers			-3.46***			-3.75***			-3.75***			-3.73***
Parents			-2.77**			-2.91***	-1.32*	-1.31*	-2.45*			-2.79**
Pupils	-.67*	-1.75*	_	-1.64*	-1.75*	_	-1.70*	-1.05*	-2.20*	-1.65*	-1.60*	-2.35*
School Officials			-3.75**			-3.50**			-3.61**			-3.32**

Table 7.6

Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Community and PTA Participation

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 16. --Attending PTA Meetings in the Auditorium												
Teachers			1.90***	-.50*		2.66***			1.68**	-.62*	-.62*	1.68***
Parents			2.40***	-.42*		2.63***			1.50**	-.54*	-.53*	2.65***
Pupils			2.24***	-.57**	-1.20***	2.36***	-.42*	-.64**	2.31***	-.84***	-.82***	2.35***
School Officials		-.84*	2.36***	-.64*		2.03***		.86**		-.64*		2.00***
Item 30. --Participating in Community Activities												
Teachers												
Parents			1.28**									1.07*
Pupils												
School Officials						1.67*						

Table 7.7

Significant Differences Between Cognitions and Reported Teacher Behavior for Non-Veridical Items

	Own			People in General			Teachers			School Officials		
	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm	Expectation	Positive Norm	Negative Norm
Item 6. --Speaking Out at PTA Meeting in the Auditorium												
Teachers		-.69**	-2.29***	-.67*	-.83**	-2.32***			-2.39***	-.63*	-.88*	-1.99***
Parents	-1.07***	-1.48***		-1.13***	-1.32***		-.86**	-1.19***	-1.54**	-.94***	-1.25***	
Pupils	-.93***	-1.32***		-1.34***	-1.48***		-1.28***	-1.63***		-1.34***	-1.55***	
School Officials		-1.64***	-1.85**	-.97**	-.91**	-3.08***			-3.26***		-.73*	-2.61***
Item 28. --Doing Menial Tasks During Basketball Games												
Teachers			-4.00***	-1.33*		-2.64*			-3.43**	-1.23*	-1.00*	-2.28*
Parents	-1.02*		-4.00***	-1.39*	-1.20*	-2.80**			-3.09**	-1.38*	-1.31**	-2.37*
Pupils	-1.46*	-1.30*	-2.43*	-1.43*	-1.46*	-2.48*	-1.22*	-1.40*	-2.42*	-1.50*	-1.40*	-2.03*
School Officials			-3.57**	-1.50**	-1.25*	-3.50**	-1.50*		-3.57**			-3.00*

7.63 School official respondents both wanted more teacher PTA participation, and attributed such desires to Teachers, than was reported as actual teacher behavior. School officials thought that People in General and School Officials, however, expected more attendance than teachers actually reported.

Table 7.7 displays two items which exhibit a good deal of cognitive distortion and are characterized by Type 3 and 5 responses. Item 6 - Speaking out at PTA Meetings in the Auditorium might have been reported in Table 7.6 except that the pattern of responses is quite different from those of the previous table. It seems to share with Item 28 - Doing Menial Tasks During Basketball Games a 'sore toe' quality for teachers. For both items, teachers dislike doing the behavior involved and report doing almost none of it. This is not understood by respondents - including teachers!

7.71 Parents and pupils were alike in desiring and expecting considerable speaking out at PTA which was not matched by reported teacher behavior. (In fact, the negative norms of these positions tended to match actual teacher behavior.) Moreover, parents and pupils attributed their own expectations and norms to People in General, Teachers and School Officials indiscriminately.

7.72 Teachers and School Officials were alike in holding veridical expectations for speaking out at PTA. They would have desired, however, more participation than was reported by teachers. Moreover, they felt that both People in General and School Officials both desired and expected considerable PTA participation (as compared with reported teacher behavior). Finally - the norms and expectations they attributed to Teachers were insignificantly different from reported behaviors.

7.73 Responses for doing menial tasks tended to exhibit the school-official-public stereotype in that both School Officials and People in General were seen as expecting and wanting more performance of menial tasks than teachers reported doing. (School official respondents, as usual, were veridical in cognitions attributed to School Officials.)

7.74 In addition, parental respondents and pupil respondents both expected and desired more performance of menial tasks than was reported by teachers. Pupils also attributed their cognitions to Teachers.

Summary and Commentary

It is worthwhile to make a brief summary and interpretation at this point. Additional summaries may be found in Chapter VIII.

Own and Attributed Cognitions. It is not surprising to discover that own cognitions are more veridical than those attributed to others. In fact, the expectations of teachers and school officials are never significantly different from reported teacher behaviors. Assuming an honest attempt to judge (and value) a social reality by respondents, that they estimate the cognitions of others differently suggests that they feel others are biased in their viewpoints and/or they simply lack information about the cognitive structures of others. Together with the findings from Chapter VI - which indicate that people share a good deal of misinformation about the likes, dislikes and expectations of others, suggests a complex relationship between shared cognitive structures and a stable institution of behaviors. Standard theories of normative integration stress the necessity for shared-accurate-veridical cognitive structures in a stable institution. It is here suggested that while shared cognitive structures are necessary, that some types of institutional stability may stem from persistent inaccuracies and non-veridicalities.

Sentient Object Positions. At the same time, sentient object positions are not treated identically by respondents. The appearance of a school-official-public stereotype suggests that respondents (except school officials) see School Officials and People in General in agreement on a number of critical issues regarding teacher behavior - which agreement is generally not shared by respondents. Putting together the evidence of Chapters VI and VII, this supposed agreement is neither veridical nor accurate. Teachers, as sentient objects, are sometimes treated as school personnel, sometimes as reality-oriented, and sometimes as uniquely biased depending upon the content area under examination.

Respondent Positions. Finally, the patterns of nonveridicality differ from respondent position to respondent position. Pupils, not too surprisingly, are the least veridical in both own and attributed cognitions. They are closely followed by parents (who share much of their biases). Teachers and school officials tend to be quite similar in patterns of veridicality - except when estimating School Officials cognitions and for issues of self-indulgence.

CHAPTER VIII

RESULTS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The summary and interpretation of the many findings reported in this volume is a difficult task. In general, two attempts will be made. We will first summarize the findings in terms of the major theoretical dimensions of role represented in the studies. Then, we will discuss selected findings as they apply to an understanding of teacher role. Implications will be added to each summary.

Findings for Role Theory

Teacher entrance into Settings. Numerous differences appeared among respondent positions in forms for teacher entrance into settings, but expectational differences appeared to reflect little more than chance variation (2.31). In general, positions lined up so that teachers and school officials were at variance with norms of pupils, while parents tended to occupy a middle position (2.32). School personnel positions tended to be more tolerant of teacher than were parents or pupils (2.33), to want more teacher intrusion into matters of deviancy control (2.35), and to expect less self-indulgence. Positional differences tended to disappear for settings for which teachers were strongly expected to be (or not to be) found (2.34).

As the three studies were originally laid out, norms and expectations for teacher entrance into settings were ancillary to the focal question - what did a teacher do when in a setting (or other) context? Thus, we would not have been surprised to discover no differences among positions for cognitions about teacher entrance; nor would such a finding have detracted from other findings to be presented.

Nevertheless, there are significant differences between positions, and these differences tend to parallel those found in other chapters.

This suggests that teacher role consists, in part, of diffuse cognitive structures which are nevertheless held uniquely by persons of different backgrounds. Role conflict for the teacher is well established in these data. A number of questions remain to be explored, notably the bounds of the diffuse structure and the interactive effects of structural dissonance. (What would happen, for instance, to norms for teacher behavior laid within a disapproved setting?)

Content Frameworks Used in Teacher Role. Chapters III and IV exhibit a large number of findings pertaining to the content frameworks used by respondents in conceptualizing teacher role in trait and behavioral terms. Once again, many of these findings are similar. Teacher and school official respondents tend to be contrasted with parents and more distantly with pupils in terms of usage (3.11, 4.12, 4.13). A wider variety of cognitive content is used by adults than by pupils (3.14), while both parents and pupils use cognitive generalities in comparison with the specifics of teacher description employed by educators (3.23, 4.22, 4.31). Parents and pupils are concerned about emotional support of pupils (3.23, 4.21), while teacher and school officials are concerned with teacher ability and performance (3.13). In general, pupil concerns tend to be expressed in terms of an all-American ethic, although the same tendency may be noted in all respondents, particularly for volunteered positive norms and expectations (3.13). Surprisingly, positions tend to differ more in the usage of manner (rather than action) frameworks (3.12), while significant differences in usage appear for all three types of cognitions considered. All positions are alike in tending to give particularistic complaints for negative norms in contrast with the general, optimistic, manneristic "soup" volunteered for positive norms and expectations.

These findings support several propositions relating to the sophistication of role cognitions. Age appears to produce a wider vocabulary of available judgemental scales, while training (and perhaps a reduction in social distance) appear to result in a focusing of concerns upon behavioral specifics.

Surprisingly, manners (rather than actions) and negative norms (rather than expectations or positive norms) tend to produce the same effects of sharpening. Is it possible that urban civilization provides its sharpest definitions of role in terms of prohibitions and styles, or are these results artifactive and due to our superficial methodology?

If valid, these results suggest another type of role conflict which (to our knowledge) has not previously been discussed in the literature. It is possible that positions may differ not only in forms (and expectations) held for the teacher but also in terms of the very concerns with which teachers are viewed. Thus, if parents and pupils are concerned over emotional support of the pupil while school officials are worried about instructional ability, the teacher may suffer pressures due to differing definitions of role content. The logical relationships between content-conflict and scale-conflict are not worked out here, but we have evidence that both types of conflict exist for the teacher.

Scaling of Volunteered Data. The data from both Chapters III and IV were scaled, and differences among positions were analysed for possible significant disparities. In neither case were other than randomly significant differences obtained.

There are at least four reasons why a scale point analysis of volunteered role cognitions would fail to reveal positional disparities. (1) It is possible that community positions are, indeed, uniform in forms and expectations held for the teacher. (This unlikely explanation is contradicted in the data from Chapter V.) (2) It is also possible that scaling techniques, small N's or the nature of the non-probed, volunteered responses rendered the attempted analysis insensitive to existant disparities. (3) It should be noted that analysis could be made only of responses given by the self-selected sample of respondents for whom the content area involved was sufficiently salient to elicit a volunteered response. It is possible that this non-random sample for

TABLE 8.1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF SIGNIFICANT DISPARITIES BETWEEN POSITIONS (AMONG AVAILABLE ITEMS) FOR VOLUNTEERED BEHAVIORS AND TRAITS

Cognition Type	Teachers X Parents	Teachers X Pupils	Teachers X School Officials	Parents X Pupils	Parents X School Officials	Pupils X School Officials	Total	
Expectation	20(13%)	28(18%)	5(3%)	23(15%)	11(7%)	19(12%)	106(12%)	Data for Behaviors (N=153*
Positive Norm	18(12%)	24(16%)	9(6%)	33(22%)	18(12%)	11(7%)	113(12%)	
Negative Norms	13(8%)	21(14%)	3(2%)	19(12%)	16(10%)	20(13%)	92(10%)	
Total	51(11)	73(16%)	17(4%)	75(16%)	45(10%)	50(11%)	311	
Expectation	8(15%)	15(28%)	3(6%)	19(36%)	5(9%)	18(34%)	68(21%)	Data for Traits (N=53*
Positive Norm	6(11%)	20(38%)	1(2%)	15(28%)	10(19%)	20(38%)	72(23%)	
Negative Norm	10(19%)	17(32%)	0(0%)	15(28%)	9(17%)	15(28%)	66(21%)	
Total	24(15%)	52(33%)	4(3%)	49(31%)	24(15%)	53(33%)	206	

* N=Maximum number of possibly significant disparities per cell.

respondents exhibited cognitive uniformity, while a random sample would not. (4) Finally, it should be noted that the majority of salient items reflect issues of general morality, particularly those stemming from positive norms and expectational questions. It is doubtful that items having such a content would elicit controversy or positional disparities in teacher role cognition.

The last interpretation, which we are inclined to favor, suggests that saliency of role cognitions does not necessarily imply controversy. It also implies that whereas a scaled analysis of negative norms reveals few differences which are not also reflected in positive norms, that volunteered negative norms are uniquely useful for suggesting areas of controversy or positional disparity. Other researchers are advised to consider using negative norms for the eliciting of fruitful content areas but to avoid wasting time scale-pointing volunteered cognitions.

Traits and Behaviors. What, if anything, has been gained by studying both trait and behavioral cognitions volunteered for the leader? Apart from relatively minor content disparities, there is a remarkable similarity in the findings from Chapters III and IV. Is there nothing to be gained in studying both types of volunteered cognitions?

Table 8.1 gives a partial answer to this question. This table was drawn from the data originally displayed in Tables 3.10 and 4.1 and displays in comparative forms the number and percentage of positional comparisons examined which generated statistically significant ($p < .05$) disparities. In examining Table 8.1 it should be recalled that while only 53 trait items were examined for positional disparities, 153 unique behavioral combinations were similarly examined. Thus, the absolute number of significant disparities is incommensurable between the two halves of the table (hence the percentages). It should also be recalled that a more complex method of coding behavior data was employed and that smaller N's were involved in behavioral comparisons, which together may account for the generally smaller number of significant disparties in the behavioral data.

It should be observed, however, that the major increase in trait differences occurs among comparisons _involving the pupil position_. In fact, there are no other systematic differences between the two halves of the table. Evidently there are greater disparities between adults and children for trait cognitions (about teachers) than for behavioral cognitions. This, in turn, implies that the trait concept (as a level of abstraction) is more sophisticated than the behavioral concept. It is possible that the specifics of context lead adult and child respondents alike to focus upon a shared experience of reality, while children have not generally formed trait cognitions divorced from context. Whatever the interpretation, the data from Table 8.1 are provocative.

Positional Differences for Scaled Data. Chapter V abounds with significant findings pertaining to positional disparities for pre-coded items. It was discovered that positions were far more disparate in own cognitions than in cognitions attributed to others, similarly that they shared a stereotype about cognitions attributed to School Officials (5.11). Once again, pupils were found to be the most dissidant of positions (5.12) with teachers and school officials standing closest together (5.13). In general, pupils favor less maintenance of order (5.23) and supervising of pupils (5.71) than do adults. Parents and pupils are less in favor of teacher self-indulgence (5.41), want more deviancy control (5.31, and want teachers to speak out at PTA (5.51). Teachers are at odds with others over speaking out at PTA (5.51), and doing menial tasks (5.76). Other content findings may be found in the body of Chapter 5.

Taken together, Chapter V is the best set of evidence in the entire study for concluding that role conflict exists for teachers in Kansas City. Whether or not teachers are aware of these differences, differential standards exist for teacher behavior in the norms (and expectations) carried by various positions. Moreover, these disparities are strongest in the own cognitions held by respondents. There is a tendency for a sharing of stereotypes about the opinions of People in General and School Officials (a sharing which constitutes a pluralistic ignorance - see below). It should also be observed that these disparities are greater for norms than for expectations. In only a few instances does role conflict appear for expectations without its mirror also appearing in the positive norm comparison.

All of which raise legitimate questions about the integration of the school as an institution. It is assumed in normative integrationist theories that a minimum amount of normative agreement is necessary for institutional stability. The existance of wide-spread disagreements in teacher role suggests either that the school is undergoing rapid change or that considerable strains must be present in this prevalent institution. Whichever interpretation is favored, it is implied that teachers, parents, pupils, and school officials alike must suffer in considerable part from lack of agreement over such issues as deviancy control, supervision of pupils, attendance at PTA meetings and the like.

Positional Differences in Accuracy. If positions do not agree about norms and expectations for teacher behavior, do they agree on estimates of the cognitions of others? Chapter VI presents data to the contrary. Not only did respondents share a number of mistaken stereotypes in cognitions attributed to Teachers and School Officials, but significant differences appeared between positions in accuracy. Teacher and school official respondents were significantly better in estimating cognitions than were parents or pupils. Parents and pupils overestimate the desires of both Teachers and School Officials for maintenance of order (6.31, 6.32), for threats against the pupil (6.41, 6.42) and in numerous other areas. School officials underestimate the amount of attendance at PTA desired and expected by Teachers (6.72), while teacher respondents share in inaccuracies concerned with control of pupil behavior (6.51, 6.52). Once again, the greatest number of disparities are to be found among norms, although the difference between norms and expectations is less for estimates given to School Officials than it is for Teachers.

Apart from the significance of shared, inaccurate stereotypes (see below), it is significant to discover once again that teachers and school officials are generally better able to estimate their own and other's cognitions in the school system. And once again, pupils are the worst off of any responding position. A legitimate question may be raised about the amount of communication between school personnel and parents or pupils. Particularly significant are the large number of inaccuracies in parental and pupil attribution of norms to Teachers. (Fully 40% of normative attributions by parents and 50% by pupils were significantly inaccurate.) It is strongly implied that teachers do not communicate their own values to these two groups.

Positional Differences in Veridicality. Finally, positions also differed in veridicality of cognitions held or attributed. When judged against reported teacher behavior, once again the cognitions of teachers were most veridical, followed closely by school officials, and then less closely by parents and pupils. For all positions own cognitions were more veridical than cognitions assigned to others, although cognitions attributed to Teachers ran second. In general, respondents attributed to People in General, and all respondents except school officials attributed to School Officials, norms and expectations which were more conservative than indicated teacher behavior. Non-veridicality in own norms and expectations held by parents and pupils appeared in matters of deviancy control, teacher self-indulgence, speaking out at PTA, and the doing of menial tasks. Interestingly enough, norms tended to be no less veridical than were expectations.

As in so many other cases, teachers and school officials were more veridical in cognitions held and attributed. This suggests that parents and pupils not only do not communicate with school personnel but do not observe actual teacher behavior in the school. (That this is not true for pupils suggests a primacy of the effects of age.) And once again we should raise the question, how can the school persist as an institution with so little accuracy and veridicality and so many conflicts in role cognitions about teacher behavior?

The Comparative Status of Errors. It is useful to examine the evidence for role conflict, accuracy and veridicality side-by-side. Table 8.2 presents in comparative forms the numbers and percentages of statistically significant ($p < .05$) disparities found for each of the 30 items examined in these three analyses. The data from the three sub-tables of Table 8.2 are strictly comparable as they were derived from the same basic data using identical statistical techniques. The data in Table 8.2 were taken from Tables 5.1, 6.1, and 7.1 respectively.

Several things are worth noting in Table 8.2. First of all why are norms no less veridical than expectations (both own and attributed)? Since only the expectation is modeled after "reality", one would assume expectations to be more veridical. In contrast with accuracy and positional difference, both of which show greater normative disparities, the lack of findings for veridicality are particularly surprising. In looking at the findings for own cognitions, however, it may be observed that for the three adult positions expectations are slightly more veridical than norms. It is possible that "pupil culture" emphasizes a complaining and pessimistic view of teacher behavior which is reflected in pupil expectations, while pupil norms tend to correspond more with what teachers report doing. It should be noted, however, that pupil norms are at considerable variance with the norms of other respondents (such as teachers or school officials) which, in turn, are more veridical than those of pupils. The problem needs further exploration.

It is also interesting to note that accuracy is generally lower than veridicality for positions. That is, all four positions make more errors in estimating the cognitions of others than they do in estimating teacher behaviors with their own cognition. (For attributed cognitions, the relationship reverses.) However, the increase in error rate is much greater, when moving from veridicality to accuracy, among the non-school positions than among teachers and school

TABLE 8.2

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SIGNIFICANT DISPARITIES FOR ACCURACY, VERIDICALITY, AND POSITIONAL DIFFERENCES

Subject Positions	Accuracy of cognitions attributed to:		Veridicality of cognitions attributed to:				Positional Differences* between subjects and:			
	Teachers	School Officials	of own Cognitions	People in General	Teachers	School Officials	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
Data for Expectations										
Teachers	1(3%)	3(10%)	0(0%)	6(20%)	1(3%)	6(20%)	------	9(30%)	10(33%)	3(10%)
Parents	7(23%)	8(27%)	3(10%)	8(27%)	5(17%)	14(47%)	9(30%)	------	4(13%)	5(17%)
Pupils	10(33%)	11(37%)	9(30%)	11(37%)	9(30%)	12(40%)	10(33%)	4(13%)	------	6(20%)
School Officials	4(13%)σ	0(0%)	0(0%)	14(47%)	3(10%)	3(10%)	3(10%)	5(17%)	6(20%)	------
Totals	22(18%)	22(18%)	12(10%)	39(33%)	18(15%)	35(29%)	22(25%)	18(20%)	20(22%)	14(16%)
Data for Positive Norms										
Teachers	1(3%)	3(10%)	1(3%)	3(10%)	0(0%)	7(23%)	------	12(40%)	12(40%)	4(13%)
Parents	12(40%)	10(33%)	4(13%)	8(27%)	8(27%)	12(40%)	12(40%)	------	9(30%)	8(27%)
Pupils	15(50%)	11(37%)	5(17%)	11(37%)	10(33%)	12(40%)	12(40%)	9(30%)	------	7(23%)
School Officials	3(10%)	0(0%)	2(7%)	11(37%)	4(13%)	2(7%)	4(13%)	8(27%)	7(23%)	------
Totals	31(26%)	24(20%)	12(10%)	33(28%)	22(18%)	33(28%)	28(31%)	29(32%)	28(31%)	19(21%)

*Data given are for own cognitions only.

officials. In general, the rate of positional disparities in these data approximates the rates of inaccuracy rather than the lesser rate of non-veridicality of own cognitions.

Findings for Teacher Role

Positional Differences. It seems clear that a number of disparities exist among teachers, school officials, parents and pupils over teacher role cognitions. These disparities may be found for both norms and expectations, for own and attributed cognitions, for teacher behaviors and traits, and for teacher behavior laid against a variety of contexts. Among the four positions examined, pupils were found to be at considerable variance from adults on a variety of issues. Teachers and school officials tended to hold quite similar role elements while parents tended to fall between school personnel and pupils. These disparities occurred in a variety of content areas.

We began the volume by suggesting that inter-positional disparities constituted "role conflict for the teacher" in the sense that the teacher was caught between conflicting pictures or values for her behavior. It is useful to examine this assumption.

It seems unlikely that the disparities between pupils and adult role elements presents much of a problem for teachers. If age is the major factor responsible, pupils may be assumed to "grow out of it" in time. In addition, despite their prevalence in the school, pupils do not have much real power in the determination of school events. The pupil who is faced with a teacher who violates his norms or expectations is ordinarily powerless to take action either against the individual teacher or against the school system.

The reverse is true for parent-teacher, parent-school official or school official-teacher disparities. In each case the actors have considerable power and may, under certain circumstances, exercise it. The parent, for instance, who is incensed at the activities of a grade-school teacher may create all sorts of trouble for that teacher or for the school administrator who supports her. It is strongly implied, therefore, that such wide-spread disparities as are revealed in this study are a major source or irritation for public school teachers in Kansas City.

At the same time, it is not clear from these data that teachers adequately "perceive" these conflicting disparities nor what they choose to do about resolving the dilemmas thus created. It is possible, for instance, for teachers to be unaware of existant disparities,suggesting that deviant teachers might receive the splean of offended school officials, parents or other teachers without an understanding of the cause for annoyance. Similarly, some teachers may attribute conflicting norms or expectations where no such conflict exists. We are presently engaged in additional research which will explore these problems more fully and which will be reported in a later volume.

But role conflict for the teacher has additional implications for the school official, the school system and the wider society. Many of our findings suggest that parents are simply ignorant of much that goes on in the classroom or that they pick up misinformation from their children. When mobilized, these misinformations can prove a threat or harrassment to the official or school board member and can disrupt the serious work of the school. Or, when teachers and school officials differ significantly on standards for teacher behavior, conflicts can appear within the fabric of the institution itself.

Perhaps most seriously, with severe role conflict no objective evaluation of teacher performance is possible. When parents, teachers and school officials differ in standards of judgement for teacher behavior, then one judger's effective teacher is equivalent to another judger's anathma.

This discussion should not be taken as a prediction of collapse in the public school systems of Kansas City. One of the strengths of American education is its catholicity of competing value systems, its disparities in judgemental standards. These findings do suggest, however, that role conflict for the teacher may in some cases stand between educators and their goals. They also suggest that empirical techniques are now available for the objective evaluation of teacher role should this be desired by the local school system.

Pluralistic Ignorance in Teacher Role. A number of the findings in this volume may be interpreted in terms of pluralistic ignorance. This term comes from Schanck 5/ who has shown that under certain conditions the members of a community might share a wholly mistaken view of the norms of the group. Thus, there might exist an agreed-upon view of "public opinion" which corresponded neither with the norms of community members nor the actual behaviors of persons affected.

In another report (Biddle, Rosencranz, Tomich and Twyman, 6/) and in Volume II of this series, the authors have shown that respondents attribute to People in General conservative norms for school teacher behavior which are neither veridical nor accurate. In the data from Chapters VI and VII it may be seen that these conservative norms (and expectations) are also attributed to School Officials by all respondents except school officials themselves.

Let us assume that these findings are valid for, at least, the Kansas City community. An understanding of them requires that one answer several questions. How did the false stereotypes attributed to the public and to school officials get set up? Why don't school officials share in these stereotypes? By what means are these stereotypes maintained? What problems do these stereotypes impose on teachers and others?

It may be conjectured that conservative pluralistic ignorance of public opinion is pandemic to much of Western society. We are faced with the joint phenomena of rapid social change paired with the legitimizing pf public outcry from reactionary heel-draggers. Many persons may assume that the public continues to think of teachers in terms of the values of small-town America when they listen to the criticisms of the super-patriots, those interested in a "classical" education, and the know-nothings. Assuming this explanation, similar conservative stereotypes should be observable for many public positions.

It may also be true that teachers are peculiarly vulnerable to conservative stereotypes due to their ambiguous position of giving personal service in a public institution and their inability to form strong professional organizations which would set and enforce standards for their profession. This latter interpretation suggests that similar, conservative stereotypes might be observable for nurses, social workers, government officials and other similar professions.

Whatever its etiology, conservative pluralistic ignorance for the teacher is probably maintained through restrictions of both communication and behavioral observation. School officials and teachers must rely upon the reports of others for a description of teacher classroom behavior, while parents depend upon the dubious reporting of their own children. The school system is also notorious for lack of communication between positions due to inadequate administration, lack of time, poor facilities, and above all, poor motivation. With the exception of pupils and teachers or pupils and parents, there simply is very little interaction between the four positions studied here.

It is probable that the conservative stereotype of the School Official is additionally facilitiated by duplicity. It should be noted that school officials share in the general ignorance of public opinion concerning the teacher. The average school official, liberally (and often extensively) educated, is faced with "representing" a public whose standards run counter to his own. This undoubtedly results in a double standard of performance; conservative values for teacher behavior supported and enforced in public, liberal standards held in private. Thus, through lack of information about actual public opinion on teacher role, the school official is not only forced into upholding standards which he does not share, but he adds to his burdens by appearing as an authoritanian "fuddy-duddy" in the eyes of teachers, parents, and pupils alike. This, despite the fact that school officials are aware of the true feelings which they collectively hold!

But not only the school official suffers from the conservative, pluralisticly ignorance, stereotype. Parents and teachers are constrained from expressing opinion which they believe run counter to both public opinion and the norms of school officials. Teachers, particularly, who (in fact) share a great many norms and expectations with school officials, appear unaware of this commonality of role and are burdened with satisfying a set of standards which they don't believe in and which are not shared by school officials.

It is possible that such conservative, pluralistic ignorances are necessary for the operation of institutions similar to the public school; but the existence of misinformation always suggests an educational campaign. What would happen if school officials were appraised that public opinion was generally more liberal than they give credit for; or a serious attempt was made by the school system to sample public opinion regarding teacher role on a regular basis? It is possible that sharp changes might be wrought for the role of teacher, and that particularly the professions of teacher and school administrator might become considerably more attractive.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

APPENDIXES

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

APPENDIX A

TRAITS OF TEACHERS VOLUNTEERED BY RESPONDENTS

TABLE A.1

TRAITS VOLUNTEERED FOR POSITIVE NORM USAGE

		Teachers (N = 98)		Parents (N = 261)		Pupils (N = 237)		School Officials (N = 67)	
No.	Framework	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
010	Broadminded	15.3	1.0	6.5	1.0	2.9	1.0	17.9	1.0
015	Controls	7.1	1.0	9.5	1.0	6.3	1.0	3.0	1.0
016	Cooperative	15.3	1.0	10.6	1.0	.8	1.0	20.9	1.0
020	Disciplines	4.1	1.0	4.6	1.0	2.9	1.6	3.0	1.0
021	Discriminates	3.1	2.7	4.6	1.3	5.5	1.3		
023	Encourages	4.1	1.0	4.6	1.0	2.5	1.0		
024	Enforces	1.0	1.0	3.4	1.1	8.0	1.0	1.5	1.0
028	Expresses Satisfaction	1.0	1.0	.4	1.0	.4	1.0	1.5	1.0
032	Helps	15.3	1.0	13.7	1.0	23.5	1.0	8.9	1.0
034	Improves	5.1	1.0	.8	1.0			10.7	1.0
054	Permits					8.4	1.0		
068	Self Control	2.0	1.0	3.8	1.1	3.4	1.2	6.0	1.0
080	Discusses	2.0	1.0	5.3	1.0	8.8	1.0		
106	Appropriately	2.0	1.0	.8	1.0	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.0
107	Certainty	3.1	1.0	1.9	1.0	2.1	1.0	3.0	1.0
108	Cleanliness	5.1	1.0	4.2	1.0	1.3	1.0	6.0	1.0
112	Courteously	4.1	1.0	4.6	1.0	4.2	1.1	3.0	1.0
113	Creatively	5.1	1.0	1.5	2.0	1.7	2.0	8.9	1.0
115	Democratically	4.1	1.0	1.1	1.0	2.1	1.0	6.0	1.0
117	Diligently	5.1	1.0	.8	1.0	1.3	1.0	6.0	1.0
121	Enthusiastically	5.1	1.0	1.5	1.0	.4	1.0	8.9	1.0
122	Ethically	4.1	1.0	13.3	1.0	.8	1.0	8.9	1.0
123	Fairly	20.4	1.0	26.6	1.1	.5	1.1	13.4	1.0
124	Firmly	8.2	1.0	26.6	1.1	26.0	2.1	11.9	1.0
128	Friendly	30.6	1.0	19.8	1.0	15.1	1.0	17.9	1.0
132	Good			.4	1.0	20.6	1.0	1.5	1.0
133	Happily	6.1	1.0	7.6	1.2	5.5	1.0	8.9	1.0
135	Honestly			4.6	1.0	1.3	1.0	10.4	1.0
136	Humorously	25.5	1.0	11.4	1.0	21.4	1.1	13.4	1.0
139	Kindly	12.2	1.0	12.5	1.0	12.2	1.1	4.5	1.0
140	Knowledgeably	23.5	1.0	11.8	1.0	8.8	1.0	25.3	1.0
141	Lovingly	21.4	1.0	19.8	1.0	2.5	1.0	19.4	1.0
145	Orderly	22.4	1.0	16.3	1.0	5.0	1.0	16,4	1.0
146	Patiently	12.2	1.0	12.9	1.0	7.6	1.0	7.5	1.0
147	Personably	13.3	1.0	8.0	1.0	4.2	1.1	19.4	1.0
148	Pleasantly	20.4	1.0	16.3	1.0	10.9	1.2	10.4	1.0
151	Professionally	12.2	1.0	6.5	1.0			17.9	1.0
155	Reasonably			3.8	1.4	5.9	1.1		
160	Sincerely	10.2	1.0	5.7	1.0	1.7	1.0	17.9	1.0
163	Thoughtfully	24.5	1.0	25.8	1.0	13.9	1.0	20.9	1.0
164	Well-groomed	17.3	1.0	8.0	1.0	7.1	1.0	19.4	1.0
165	Modern	4,1	1.0	2.7	1.6	.8	3.0		
166	Interestingly	2.0	1.0	4.9	1.0	7.1	1.0	3.0	1.0

TABLE A.1 (Continued)

		Teachers (N = 98)		Parents (N = 261)		Pupils (N = 237)		School Officials (N = 67)	
No.	Framework	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
201	Able to do	13.3	1.0	8.7	1.2	2.1	1.0	17.9	1.0
206	Enjoy doing	8.2	1.0	8.0	1.0	2.5	1.0	13.5	1.0
210	Interested in	20.4	1.0	19.8	1.0	4.2	1.0	11.9	1.0
211	Motivated to	3.1	1.0	7.2	1.2			10.4	1.0
301	Young	1.0	1.0	3.8	2.7	5.9	2.9	1.5	4.0
305	Attractive	5.1	1.0	1.9	1.2	5.0	1.1	1.5	1.0
310	Pleasant voice	5.1	1.0	4.2	1.0	2.1	1.0	3.0	1.0
311	Smart	3.1	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.3	1.3	10.4	1.1
401	Community Participation	2.0	1.0	1.9	1.0			7.4	1.0
416	Educated	8.2	1.0	7.6	1.0	1.7	1.0	11.9	1.0

TABLE A.2

TRAITS VOLUNTEERED FOR NEGATIVE NORM USAGE

		Teachers (N = 98)		Parents (N = 261)		Pupils (N = 237)		School Officials (N = 67)	
No.	Framework	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
010	Broadminded	27.5	4.9	14.1	5.0	6.3	5.0	19.4	4.9
015	Controls	5.1	4.4	7.6	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.7
016	Cooperative	10.2	4.9	7.2	5.0	.4	5.0	16.4	4.6
020	Disciplines	7.1	5.0	2.7	4.4	.4	1.0	6.0	5.0
021	Discriminates	11.2	5.0	38.4	4.9	21.4	4.9	7.4	5.0
023	Encourages	2.0	5.0	.4	5.0	.8	5.0		
024	Enforces			2.3	3.0	4.6	3.2	3.0	3.0
028	Expresses Satisfaction	13.3	5.0	3.0	5.0	1.3	5.0	20.9	5.0
032	Helps	3.1	5.0	2.3	5.0	3.8	4.6		
034	Improves	5.1	5.0	.4	5.0			6.0	5.0
054	Permits			.4	1.0	5.5	4.5		
068	Self Control	6.1	5.0	11.0	5.0	10.5	5.0	8.9	5.0
080	Discusses			4.2	4.1	8.0	4.1	3.0	3.0
106	Appropriately	3.1	5.0	4.6	5.0	3.8	5.0	3.0	5.0
107	Certainty	6.1	5.0	1.5	5.0	1.7	5.0	3.0	5.0
108	Cleanliness	1.0	5.0	1.1	5.0	.4	5.0	1.5	5.0
112	Courteously	4.1	5.0	1.1	5.0	1.7	4.2	1.5	5.0
113	Creatively	2.0	5.0	1.9	5.0	1.7	5.0	6.0	5.0
115	Democratically	4.1	5.0	1.9	5.0	2.5	5.0	4.5	5.0
117	Diligently	14.3	5.0	1.1	5.0	.4	5.0	20.9	4.7
121	Enthusiastically	1.0	5.0	.8	5.0	.8	4.5		
122	Ethically	9.2	5.0	2.7	5.0	.8	5.0	3.0	3.0
123	Fairly	9.2	5.0	9.5	5.0	9.7	4.8	7.4	5.0
124	Firmly	6.1	3.7	11.4	3.8	23.5	2.6	4.5	2.3
128	Friendly	7.1	4.4	11.4	4.9	4.6	5.0	8.9	5.0
132	Good	1.0	5.0	.8	5.0	6.7	4.8		
133	Happily	11.2	5.0	10.6	5.0	12.2	5.0	8.9	5.0
135	Honestly	5.1	5.0	.4	5.0			7.4	5.0
136	Humorously	4.1	5.0	1.9	5.0	5.9	5.0	3.0	5.0
139	Kindly	4.1	5.0	3.0	5.0	9.2	5.0	4.5	3.7
140	Knowledgeably	9.2	4.8	3.8	5.0	3.8	5.0	4.5	5.0
141	Lovingly	5.1	5.0	2.3	5.0	1.7	4.8	10.4	4.4
145	Orderly	10.2	5.0	4.2	5.0	2.1	5.0	14.9	5.0
146	Patiently	10.2	5.0	6.8	4.8	5.9	5.0	3.0	5.0
147	Personably			1.5	4.8	.4	5.0	7.4	5.0
148	Pleasantly	3.1	5.0	1.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	1.5	5.0
151	Professionally	29.6	4.9	11.8	5.0	.8	5.0	31.3	5.0
155	Reasonably	3.1	5.0	10.3	5.0	20.2	5.0		
160	Sincerely	5.1	1.0	6.5	4.8	2.1	5.0	11.9	5.0
163	Thoughtfully	11.2	5.0	9.1	5.0	4.6	5.0	10.4	5.0
164	Well-groomed	17.3	5.0	10.3	5.0	5.5	4.8	23.8	4.7
165	Modern	2.0	5.0	1.5	5.0	.4	1.0	4.5	4.7
166	Interestingly	2.0	5.0	1.1	5.0	4.2	5.0	4.5	5.0

TABLE A.2 (Continued)

		Teachers (N = 98)		Parents (N = 261)		Pupils (N = 237)		School Officials (N = 67)	
No.	Framework	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
201	Able to do	8.2	4.9	4.9	5.0	.8	5.0	11.9	5.0
206	Enjoy doing	2.0	5.0	1.5	5.0			4.5	5.0
210	Interested in	11.2	4.8	11.4	5.0	1.7	5.0	11.9	5.0
211	Motivated to	2.0	5.0	.8	5.0	.4	5.0	3.0	5.0
301	Young	1.0	5.0	8.0	3.6	5.0	4.7	3.0	3.0
305	Attractive			.4	4.0			3.0	5.0
310	Pleasant Voice	7.1	5.0	3.0	5.0	.8	5.0		
311	Smart			.4	5.0	.8	4.5	4.5	5.0
401	Community Participation	2.0	5.0	.4	5.0			4.5	5.0
416	Educated	1.0	5.0	2.7	4.9	.8	5.0	7.4	4.8

TABLE A.3

TRAITS VOLUNTEERED FOR EXPECTATION USAGE

		Teachers (N = 98)		Parents (N = 261)		Pupils (N = 237)		School Officials (N = 67)	
No.	Framework	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
101	Broadminded	22.4	2.6	6.8	2.7	2.9	3.9	13.4	3.1
015	Controls	4.1	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.4	1.3		
016	Cooperative	10.2	1.0	9.1	1.9	1.7	1.0	22.4	1.3
020	Disciplines	4.1	4.0	2.7	1.6	.4	1.0		
021	Discriminates			3.8	4.2	10.9	3.3		
023	Encourages	3.1	2.3	3.4	1.6	.8	1.0		
024	Enforces	2.0	2.5	1.9	2.6	6.3	1.9	1.5	1.0
028	Expresses Satisfaction	5.1	4.8	1.1	4.0	2.5	4.3	1.5	1.0
032	Helps	12.2	1.3	10.6	1.3	16.0	1.2	11.9	1.0
034	Improves	10.2	1.8	1.9	1.0			16.4	1.0
054	Permits			.8	1.0	6.7	2.2		
068	Self control	3.1	3.3	2.7	1.9	5.0	3.4	6.0	1.0
080	Discusses	1.0	5.0	2.7	3.6	12.6	1.5		
106	Appropriately					.4	5.0		
107	Certainty	2.0	3.0	2.3	2.3	.8	1.0	4.5	3.0
108	Cleanliness	2.0	1.0	4.2	1.1	1.7	1.0		
112	Courteously	4.1	1.0	3.0	1.0	4.2	1.1	3.0	1.0
113	Creatively	3.1	2.3	3.0	3.1	1.7	2.0	10.4	3.3
115	Democratically	2.0	5.0			3.4	3.4	4.5	3.3
117	Diligently	19.4	1.7	3.0	1.5	2.5	1.7	17.9	1.3
121	Enthusiastically	4.1	1.0	2.3	1.8	1.7	2.3	8.9	1.0
122	Ethically	4.1	1.3	5.3	1.0	1.3	1.0	8.9	2.3
123	Fairly	14.3	1.4	13.3	2.1	7.6	2.4	7.4	1.8
124	Firmly	4.1	1.0	6.8	2.0	23.5	2.0	4.5	1.0
128	Friendly	11.2	1.4	14.8	1.3	14.3	1.3	16.4	1.4
132	Good	1.0	1.0	9.1	1.5	23.5	1.4	4.5	1.7
133	Happily	9.2	1.9	3.8	3.4	6.3	2.4	7.4	1.6
135	Honestly	5.1	1.2	4.9	1.3	1.3	2.0	16.4	1.0
136	Humorously	9.2	1.4	3.4	1.1	13.4	1.8	6.0	1.5
139	Kindly	7.1	1.4	8.0	1.0	10.9	1.7	6.0	2.0
140	Knowledgeably	10.2	1.5	5.7	1.6	6.7	1.8	11.9	1.9
141	Lovingly	15.3	1.1	19.4	1.3	5.5	1.2	17.9	1.0
145	Orderly	10.2	1.0	10.6	1.1	5.5	1.3	13.4	1.1
146	Patiently	9.2	1.4	10.6	2.0	7.1	1.8	6.0	1.0
147	Personably	6.1	2.2	4.9	1.8	3.8	1.3	6.0	2.0
148	Pleasantly	6.1	1.0	7.2	1.0	6.3	1.1	7.4	1.0
151	Professionally	24.5	2.7	19.4	3.0	.4	1.0	23.8	2.2
155	Reasonably	1.0	5.0	4.6	3.7	10.5	3.0		
160	Sincerely	11.2	1.1	6.1	1.9	1.3	1.0	20.9	1.0
163	Thoughtfully	21.4	1.2	20.1	1.7	12.6	1.5	13.4	1.0
164	Well-groomed	15.3	2.0	6.5	1.8	6.3	1.4	14.9	1.9
165	Modern	4.1	2.0	2.3	2.5	.8	3.0	1.5	5.0
166	Interestingly	3.1	1.3	3.0	1.9	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.0

TABLE A.3 (Continued)

		Teachers (N = 98)		Parents (N = 261)		Pupils (N = 237)		School Officials (N = 67)	
No.	Framework	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean	n	Mean
201	Able to do	11.2	2.5	12.9	1.9	2.5	2.0	14.9	2.6
206	Enjoy doing	9.2	1.0	8.7	1.1	2.9	1.1	4.5	1.0
210	Interested in	19.4	1.3	20.9	1.7	4.2	1.5	29.8	1.3
211	Motivated to			.8	1.0				
301	Young	2.0	3.0	7.2	3.4	8.4	3.0	1.5	5.0
305	Attractive	1.0	1.0	.8	1.0	2.5	1.3		
310	Pleasant Voice	3.1	1.0	1.9	1.8	2.1	1.0	3.0	1.0
311	Smart	3.1	1.7	4.9	1.4	3.4	1.9	10.4	1.3
401	Community Participation	8.2	2.0	3.4	1.0			14.9	2.1
416	Educated	10.2	2.8	8.0	1.8	.8	1.0	13.4	2.1

APPENDIX B

UNIQUE BEHAVIORS VOLUNTEERED BY RESPONDENTS

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE B

ITEMS USED IN CODING VOLUNTEERED TEACHER BEHAVIORS

Item No.	Item
101	Answers
102	Attends
103	Aware of
104	Encourages
105	Concentrates
106	Demonstrates
107	Disciplines
108	Encourages
109	Enters
110	Evaluates
111	Helps
112	Instructs
113	Interferes
114	Keeps busy
115	Leisure activity
116	Listens to
117	Meets
118	Model (be a)
119	Moves about
120	Observes
121	Officiates
122	Participates
124	Polices
125	Praises
126	Presence in setting
127	Reads
128	Self-control
129	Sings
130	Smokes
131	Studies
132	Suggests
133	Supervises
134	Verbalizes
135	Works
136	Courteously
137	Dignifiedly
138	Enthusiastically
139	Firmly
140	Friendlily
141	Happily
142	Pleasantly
143	Quietly
144	Well groomed
201	Friendly Pupils
202	Interest in Games
203	Non-task interest (audience participation)
204	Arranging books on shelves
205	Aware of games
206	Aware of meetings
207	Aware of rules
208	Cheering the team
209	Demonstrating how to play games
210	Directing games
211	Severe disciplining
212	Disciplining a pupil
213	Disciplining pupils (group)
214	Disciplining unacceptable behavior
215	Disciplines firmly
216	Discriminates (has "teacher's pet")
217	Encourages sportsmanship
218	Encourages participation
219	Encourages team
220	Evaluates assignments
221	Experiments with tasks (introduces alternatives)
222	Consumes food and drink
223	Helps pupils
224	Helps one who needs assistance
225	Helps willingly to
226	Helps with tasks
227	Instructs tasks
228	Instructs (teaches) sportsmanlike behavior
229	Instructs games
230	Interferes with pupils
231	Leads (directs) tasks
232	Leads (directs) pupils
233	Leisure activity and meetings (participates)
234	Leisure activity and games (participates)
235	Listens to meetings
236	Listens to alertly
237	Maintains physical condition (refers to surroundings)
238	Maintains order
239	Maintains quiet
240	Maintains (atmosphere) conducive to learning
241	Meets teachers
242	Meets parents
243	Meets pupils
244	Moves about furniture
245	Moves about pupils
246	Moves about (interacts with) teachers
247	Moves about quietly
248	Observes pupils
249	Observes games
250	Observes meetings
251	Participates (joins with) pupils
252	Participates in games
253	Participates as part of an audience
254	Performs on musical instruments

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE B (Continued)

Item No.	Item
255	Plans assignments
256	Practices (rehearses) task performance
257	Reads books
258	Sings (allows pupils to sing)
259	Starts (to correct) deviancy
260	Stresses sportsmanship
261	Stresses health
262	Supervises task
263	Supervises pupils
265	Verbalizes task
266	Verbalizes quietly
267	Verbalizes (teacher object of pupil verbalization)
268	Verbalizes clearly
269	Verbalizes (teacher object of parent verbalization)
270	Verbalizes appropriately
271	Verbalizes frankly
272	Verbalizes (about games)
273	Works written matter
274	Writes personal products
275	Appears dignifiedly
276	Appears interested in
277	Appears (to be a good sport)
278	Appears (to be a good citizen)
279	Appears (to be courteous)
280	Collects money
301	Reasonably solves problems for pupils
302	Demonstrates the task to pupils
303	Directs the task appropriately
304	Disciplines appropriately pupils
305	Discriminates (aware of) pupil participation
306	Encourages participation pupils
307	Enforces task pupils
308	Enforces quiet pupils
309	Enforces health pupils
310	Consumes (eats with) privately other teachers
311	Consumes (eats with) privately the pupils
312	Help tasks (with the problems of) pupils
313	Helps (encourages pupils to be) autonomus (independent)
314	Instructs appropriately task
315	Instructs practically task
316	Instructs interestingly task
317	Maintains orderly physical condition
318	Maintains order pupils
319	Maintains quiet pupils
320	Participates energetically meetings
321	Participates games pupils
322	Permits (forbids) deviant pupil behavior
323	Permits choice pupils
324	Stresses health pupils
325	Stresses participation pupils
326	Verbalizes clearly task
327	Verbalizes (tells) task (what to do to) pupils
328	Verbalizes (talks) seriously about the task (job)
329	Appears interested in games
330	Appears interested in meetings

TABLE B.1

UNIQUE BEHAVIORS VOLUNTEERED FOR POSITIVE NORM USAGE

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
101	7.1	5.0	6.8	4.5
102	2.0	3.8	.8	3.0
103	8.2	6.9	5.9	9.0
104	4.1	1.5	.4	1.5
105				1.5
106	6.1	.8	1.7	4.5
107	3.1	5.4	1.7	1.5
108	11.2	2.7	2.1	7.5
109	2.1	.4	.8	3.0
110	10.2	3.4	.4	1.5
111	32.6	15.3	12.2	10.4
112	13.3	5.4	3.4	7.5
113	9.2	.4	5.1	3.0
114		1.1	2.5	1.5
115	17.3	10.0	4.2	14.9
116	5.1	6.1	3.8	4.5
117		1.9	.8	3.0
118	3.1	5.7	2.1	6.0
119	17.3	4.2	16.0	14.9
120	3.1	4.2	8.9	14.9
121	4.1	1.9	3.0	6.0
122	12.2	13.4	8.9	10.4
124	3.1	1.5	.4	1.5
125	1.0	1.1	1.3	
126	15.3	18.4	8.0	4.4
127	6.1	6.5	6.3	4.5
128	2.0	.8	3.0	3.0
129	1.0	.8	2.5	
130	1.0	.8		3.0
131	1.0	5.0	2.5	6.0
132	6.1	3.8	1.7	4.5
133	13.3	10.3	5.9	17.9
134	6.1	5.4	6.8	11.9
135		.4	2.5	
136	5.1	6.1	3.0	20.9
137	5.1	1.1	.8	3.0
138	3.1	2.7	.8	3.0
139	1.0	5.7	2.5	4.5
140	15.3	11.9	6.3	11.9
141	6.1	7.3	2.5	6.0
142	13.3	6.9	2.5	10.4
143	11.2	11.1	25.7	13.4
144	8.2	3.4	.8	9.0
145	5.1	7.3	1.3	6.0
201	8.2	6.1	1.7	4.5

TABLE B.1 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
202	4.1	3.8	.8	4.5
203	5.1	2.3	.8	3.0
204	1.0		.4	
205	1.0	.8	.4	3.0
206	7.1	2.3	.8	4.5
207	2.0	1.9	1.3	10.4
208	5.1	5.0	5.5	3.0
209		1.1	1.3	4.5
210	11.2	4.2	4.2	9.0
212		1.1		
213	2.0	1.5	2.1	
214	2.0	1.5	3.4	4.5
215	2.0	.8	.4	1.5
216	2.0	.4	2.1	
217	2.0	7.3	1.3	3.0
218	2.0	1.9	.8	6.0
219	3.1	3.1	.4	3.0
220	7.1	8.0	10.5	3.0
221	6.1	2.3	3.4	6.0
222	1.0	2.7	3.8	1.5
223	7.1	6.5	14.3	14.9
224	16.3	8.8	8.0	14.9
225	3.1	1.9	.4	4.5
226	5.1	1.9	8.0	9.0
227	13.3	9.2	6.3	11.9
228	3.1	8.4	1.3	6.0
229	5.1	4.2	.8	4.5
230		.4	3.8	
231	5.1	1.9	.4	3.0
232	2.0	.4	.4	1.5
233	9.2	5.4	3.4	9.0
234	17.3	9.2	2.5	11.9
235	5.1	.4	1.7	1.5
236	5.1	2.3	1.7	4.5
237	7.1	3.1	1.7	7.5
238	31.6	43.3	16.0	22.4
239	13.3	18.4	11.4	9.0
240	11.2	3.4	.4	19.4
241	2.0	2.7	1.3	4.5
242	9.2	4.2	1.7	3.0
243	3.1	3.8	2.5	61
244			3.4	1.5
245	7.1	2.3	2.1	13.4
246	2.0	1.9		1.5
247	10.2	3.1	5.1	6.0
248	6.1	6.9	8.4	4.5

TABLE B.1 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
251	8.2	6.1	6.3	7.5
252	12.2	16.5	11.1	16.4
253	4.1	6.1	1.3	
254	1.0	1.1	2.5	6.0
255	4.1	3.4	2.1	4.5
256	3.1	1.5	5.5	1.5
257	3.1		2.1	
258	8.2	3.4	5.1	9.0
259	1.0	1.5	1.3	
260	7.1	5.0	2.1	1.5
261	5.1	3.4	.8	11.9
262	10.2	7.7	.4	10.4
263	6.1	5.0	4.2	11.9
265	5.1	10.0	12.2	7.5
266	8.2	3.1	1.3	6.0
267	2.0		.4	1.5
268	7.1	5.4	3.4	10.4
269	2.0	1.5	.8	6.0
270	3.1	.8	1.3	
271	1.0	2.3	1.7	
272		2.3	4.2	3.0
273	6.1	2.7	3.0	3.0
274	1.0	.4		
275	3.1	1.5	.4	6.0
276	7.1	7.7	2.5	7.5
277	10.2	11.1	1.7	25.4
278	2.0	1.9	1.7	
279	7.1	2.7	2.5	4.5
280		.4	1.7	
302	1.0	1.9	5.1	4.5
303	3.1	1.9	5.9	4.5
304		1.1	.4	
305	5.1	4.2	1.7	1.5
306	5.1	5.4	.8	10.4
307		.4	.9	
308	1.0	1.1	5.1	
309	1.0	2.3	.8	
310		.4	.4	1.5
311	2.0	1.5	.4	3.0
312	11.2	8.0	18.1	11.9
313	16.3	9.2	7.2	14.9
314	5.1	2.7	1.7	1.5
315	5.1	1.9	2.1	7.5
316	8.2	3.1	2.5	
317	2.0	2.7	2.5	3.0
318	7.1	11.9	14.3	6.0

TABLE B.1 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
319	17.3	18.4	27.0	6.0
320	2.0	.8		1.5
321	5.1	5.0	4.2	3.0
322	1.0	6.1	7.6	1.5
323	15.3	6.5	23.2	10.4
324	2.0	6.5	1.3	3.0
325	20.4	16.5	6.8	23.9
326	7.1	5.4	7.2	6.0
327	1.0	.8	4.2	3.0
328	1.0	1.1	.8	1.5
329	10.2	3.4	2.1	1.5
330	3.1	1.5	.4	

TABLE B.2

UNIQUE BEHAVIORS VOLUNTEERED FOR NEGATIVE NORM USAGE

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
101	1.0	1.1	2.5	
102		4.6	.8	1.5
103	12.2	5.4	5.1	7.5
104			.8	1.5
105	6.1	4.2	1.3	17.9
106		.4	1.3	
107	3.1	3.4	1.3	1.5
108	4.1	.8		1.5
109	33 .7	15.7	8.4	14.9
110	1.0	.8	.4	
111	7.1	3.8	2.5	3.0
112	5.1	.8	.4	4.5
113	24.5	6.9	10.1	14.9
114	6.1	3.8	7.6	13.4
115	6.1	.8	.8	4.5
116	1.0	.8	2.1	
117	4.1	5.4	.4	7.5
118	2.0	.4	.4	3.0
119	19.4	11.1	22.8	23.9
120	1.0	3.4	3.8	
121	5.1			3.0
122	6.1	3.8	4.2	7.5
124	9.2	4.2	3.8	13.4
125	6.1	1.5	2.1	
126	14.3	15.3	10.5	16.4
127	7.1	2.3	2.1	3.0
128	9.2	8.0	10.5	4.5
129		.4	3.8	
130	8.2	6.5	2.5	17.9
131		.4		3.0
132		.4		
133	10.2	7.3	2.1	16.4
134	14.3	11.1	13.1	19.4
135		.4	1.3	1.5
136	13.3	4.2	2.1	14.9
137	12.2	6.1	3.0	10.4
138	9.2	2.3	.4	9.0
139	1.0	1.1	2.1	1.5
140	5.1	3.4	.8	6.0
141	4.1	5.4	3.0	6.0
142	6.1	3.4	.8	
143	13.3	6.5	8.4	7.5
144	4.1	5.4	1.3	11.9
145	17.3	20.7	2.5	20.9
201	2.0	1.1		3.0
202	3.1	5.7	1.3	10.4

TABLE B.2 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
203	1.0	3.1	.4	
204	2.0			
205	3.1	3.4	2.1	10.4
206	1.0	.8		7.5
207	6.1	1.5	.4	9.0
208		.4	.8	
210	5.1	1.5	.4	13.4
211	2.0	1.1	1.7	1.5
213	5.1	1.1	1.3	6.0
214	3.1	.4	1.3	4.5
215	3.1	.4	1.3	4.5
216	6.1	11.5	3.0	7.5
217		.4	.4	1.5
218	1.0	.8	.8	1.5
219		.8		1.5
220	18.4	6.5	4.2	29.8
221	1.0	.4	2.1	3.0
222	5.1	5.4	3.0	9.0
223	7.1	1.1	5.5	9.0
224	2.0	.4	.4	3.0
226		.4	1.7	4.5
227	1.0	.8	1.3	3.0
228		.4		1.5
229		.4		4.5
230	4.1	3.8	5.9	3.0
233		.4		
234	3.1	.8		
235	2.0	.4		
237	2.0	1.5		6.0
238	20.4	19.5	5.1	26.9
239	15.3	10.3	7.6	10.4
240	3.1	.4	.4	
241	7.1	5.7	.8	11.9
242	2.0			
243	2.0	.8		
244	7.1	2.7	2.5	17.9
245			.4	
247		.4		
248	3.1	1.5	2.5	4.5
249	1.0	.8	1.7	1.5
250		.4	.4	
251	1.0	.8	1.7	
252	3.1	2.3	1.7	4.5
253	2.0	.4		1.5
254			.4	
255	5.1	.4	.4	7.5

TABLE B.2 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
256	2.0		4.5	4.5
257	3.1	3.1	1.3	7.5
258		.4	.4	
260	3.1	1.9		4.5
261	1.0	1.1	.8	6.0
262	4.1			1.5
263	16.3	7.3	2.1	7.5
265	3.1	3.8	4.2	1.5
266	1.0	.8		3.0
267	6.1	2.3	1.3	7.5
268	1.0	1.1	.4	1.5
269	3.1	1.5	.4	
271			1.3	
272	1.0		.4	
273	17.3	3.4	2.1	9.0
274	3.1	1.1		10.4
276		.4		
277	8.2	6.9	1.3	23.9
278		.8	.8	1.5
280	7.1	1.1		11.9
302		.4	.4	
303	1.0	.8	2.5	3.0
305	2.0	1.5	2.5	3.0
306		.4		1.5
307	2.0	.8	5.1	
308		.8	3.8	
309	1.0	2.7	3.0	1.5
312		1.1	2.1	1.5
313	2.0	1.1		3.0
314		.4		1.5
315	1.0	.4	1.3	1.5
316		.8	.4	
317	4.1	1.9	2.1	6.0
318	6.1	8.8	7.2	16.4
319	7.1	7.3	13.1	7.5
321	2.0	.4	2.1	
322	15.3	19.2	9.3	10.4
323	9.2	4.2	11.0	3.0
324	2.0	3.4	1.3	
325	5.1	3.4	.8	10.4
326	2.0	1.5	1.7	1.5
327	1.0	.8	.8	1.5
328	1.0	.4	.4	1.5
329	1.0	1.9		
330		1.1		

TABLE B.2 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
215	1.0			1.5
225	4.1	1.1	.4	
247	2.0	.4		1.5
266	20.4	6.5	5.1	22.4
268		2.3	1.7	1.5
270	3.1	1.9	3.4	1.5
275	4.1	1.9	.8	4.5
276	20.4	9.2	2.1	14.9
279	5.1	.4	.4	3.0
303	2.0	2.7	3.4	1.5
304	2.0	1.1	.4	
311	2.0	.4	.8	1.5
314	2.0		.4	3.0
315		.4		
316	1.0			1.5
317	1.0	.4		

TABLE B.3

UNIQUE BEHAVIORS VOLUNTEERED FOR EXPECTATION USAGE

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
101	11.2	4.2	5.1	10.4
102	2.0	5.0	.8	
103	4.1	4.2	3.4	1.5
104	3.1	2.3	2.5	3.0
105	2.0	2.3	1.3	4.5
106	6.1	.8	2.5	11.9
107	5.1	2.7	2.1	7.5
108	7.1	3.4	.8	6.0
109	12.2	2.3	3.4	6.0
110	14.3	5.0	1.3	7.5
111	34.7	14.7	10.1	16.4
112	21.4	5.4	5.1	19.4
113	7.1	.8	3.0	1.5
114	4.1	3.4	5.0	1.5
115	20.4	14.6	5.1	23.9
116	10.2	6.5	6.3	9.0
117	1.0	3.1	1.3	9.0
118	3.1	3.8	4.5	10.4
119	23.5	8.9	21.9	38.8
120	7.1	11.5	10.5	16.4
121	8.2	3.8	5.1	20.9
122	12.2	10.0	3.0	11.9
124	5.1	2.7	1.3	9.0
125	4.1	.4	.8	1.5
126	10.2	13.0	6.9	13.4
127	11.2	12.6	8.0	16.4
128	4.1	.4	3.6	3.0
129	3.1	1.1	2.5	3.0
130	3.1	3.4	1.3	4.5
131	4.1	4.2	3.0	6.0
132	3.1	3.1	2.1	3.0
133	13.3	13.3	4.6	20.9
134	11.2	8.0	8.4	10.4
135			3.0	4.5
136	6.1	1.9	2.1	3.0
137	7.1	1.5	1.7	
138	2.0	1.9		
139	4.1	2.3	1.3	6.0
140	8.2	6.5	5.1	6.0
141	6.1	3.1	.8	3.0
142	5.1	3.4	.8	1.5
143	5.1	4.6	11.8	1.5
144	4.1	2.7	.4	3.0
145	2.0	5.4	1.7	1.5

TABLE B.3 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
201	4.1	3.4	.8	1.5
202	2.0	2.3		3.0
203	4.1	1.1		
204	4.1	2.3		1.5
205	4.1	.8	.4	7.5
206	3.1	.4	1.3	4.5
207	1.0	1.1	.4	4.5
208	7.1	2.7	4.2	3.0
209	4.1	1.5	2.5	6.0
210	15.3	5.0	3.0	9.0
212		1.1	1.3	3.0
213	3.1	1.9	2.5	1.5
214	1.0	2.3	2.1	4.5
215		1.5	.8	1.5
216	2.0		.8	1.5
217	6.1	1.1	.4	6.0
218			.8	3.0
219	3.1	1.1		4.5
220	23.9	32.2	20.7	38.8
221	7.1	.4	.4	4.5
222	9.2	5.7	3.4	4.5
223	4.2	8.0	29.5	29.4
224	14.4	4.6	7.2	13.4
225	5.1	3.1	.8	7.5
226	3.1	5.0	5.5	7.5
227	17.3	7.3	3.4	20.9
228	2.0	6.9	1.7	6.0
229	4.1	3.8	3.0	7.5
230	1.0	1.9	.4	1.5
231	3.1	3.1	.8	3.0
232	3.1	1.7	2.1	3.0
233	9.2	3.8	.8	6.0
234	11.2	8.3	2.5	10.4
235	5.1	1.1	3.0	
236	2.0	1.5	.8	1.5
237	5.1	1.1	.4	4.5
238	34.7	32.6	13.5	28.4
239	24.2	9.6	8.0	4.5
240	9.2	1.1	.4	10.4
241	6.2	5.4	.8	9.0
242	4.9	3.1	1.3	4.5
250	7.1	1.5	4.6	9.0
251	6.1	2.7	5.5	7.5
252	10.2	8.4	5.9	27.3
253	4.1	2.7	.8	1.5

TABLE B.3 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
254	9.2	1.5	1.3	3.0
255	11.2	18.0	5.5	17.9
256	7.1	3.4	3.4	6.0
257	6.1	1.9	3.4	10.4
258	2.0	2.3	3.0	1.5
259	5.1	1.1	2.1	6.0
260	3.1	1.9	.4	1.5
261	6.1	3.1	[illegible]	6.0
262	11.2	5.4	2.1	6.0
263	10.2	6.9	3.4	10.4
265	9.2	11.5	7.2	19.4
266	2.0	[illegible]	.8	4.5
267	4.1	.8	.4	3.0
268	4.1	.8	.8	3.0
269	4.1	2.3	.8	4.5
270	1.0	.8	2.1	1.5
271		1.1	1.7	1.5
272	2.0	1.5	1.7	3.0
273	19.4	12.3	5.1	19.4
274	2.0	1.5		3.0
275	6.1	1.5	.4	1.5
276	5.1	4.2	.8	6.0
277	6.2	5.0		7.5
278	2.0	.4		1.5
279	4.1	1.5	2.1	3.0
280	14.3	1.9	1.7	20.9
302		2.3	2.1	1.5
303	1.0	1.5	2.1	
304		.8	.8	
305	1.0	1.5	1.3	1.5
306	4.1	1.9	.4	9.0
308	1.0		4.6	
309	1.0	1.5	.8	
310	1.0	.4	.4	1.5
311	1.0	.4	1.3	6.0
312	6.1	5.7	11.4	11.9
313	6.1	5.7	3.4	10.4
314	2.0		.4	4.5
315	5.1	2.3	.8	4.5
316	7.1	1.1	1.3	1.5
317	4.1	1.5	2.1	4.5
318	9.2	8.4	1.0	6.0
319	10.2	10.7	18.1	1.5
320	1.0			
321	1.0	3.4	2.1	3.0

TABLE B.3 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
322		5.4	5.5	3.0
323	11.2	2.7	8.4	9.0
324	2.0	3.1	1.3	4.5
325	16.3	10.3	3.0	19.4
326	5.1	1.5	3.0	3.0
327	2.1	1.5	2.1	3.0
328	4.1	1.1	.8	
329	4.1			3.0
330		.8		3.0

TABLE B.4

UNIQUE BEHAVIORS VOLUNTEERED FOR COMBINED USAGE

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
101	5.3	9.2	11.4	11.9
102	4.1	9.6	2.1	4.4
103	16.3	12.3	10.1	14.9
104	6.1	3.4	3.0	4.5
105	7.1	6.1	2.5	19.4
106	9.1	1.9	5.1	14.9
107	11.2	8.8	4.2	9.0
108	18.4	5.4	2.5	20.9
109	41.8	17.2	10.5	17.9
110	19.4	6.9	1.7	7.5
111	61.2	23.3	19.8	20.9
112	32.6	9.6	7.6	25.4
113	33.7	7.7	13.5	16.4
114	10.2	6.9	12.2	14.9
115	30.6	20.7	7.6	31.3
116	14.3	11.9	10.1	11.9
117	5.1	10.0	2.1	14.9
118	6.1	8.8	3.8	14.9
119	41.8	19.5	40.9	53.7
120	10.2	16.1	15.2	25.4
121	14.3	5.4	5.9	23.9
122	22.4	20.7	11.4	19.4
124	12.2	6.9	5.5	16.4
125	11.2	3.1	3.8	1.5
126	30.6	32.2	18.1	29.8
127	20.4	17.6	11.4	20.9
128	13.3	8.4	13.1	9.0
129	3.1	1.9	7.6	3.0
130	11.2	9.6	3.0	19.4
131	5.1	6.9	4.2	9.0
132	8.2	6.5	3.4	6.0
133	26.5	19.9	9.7	34.3
134	25.5	19.9	24.1	32.8
135			5.5	6.0
136	17.3	10.0	4.2	25.4
137	17.3	8.0	3.8	10.4
138	13.3	6.1	.8	10.4
139	6.1	8.0	5.4	6.0
140	18.4	15.7	8.9	19.4
141	13.3	12.3	4.6	11.9
142	15.3	10.3	3.0	10.4
143	21.4	15.3	28.3	20.9
144	12.2	6.9	1.7	16.4
145	21.4	26.0	3.8	25.4
201	13.3	8.8	2.5	6.0
202	7.1	9.2	2.1	14.9

TABLE B.4 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
203	7.1	5.7	.8	3.0
204	5.1	2.3	.4	1.5
205	8.2	5.0	2.5	14.9
206	9.2	3.4	2.1	16.4
207	6.1	3.8	1.7	13.4
208	10.2	6.9	7.2	6.0
209	4.1	2.3	3.4	9.0
210	23.5	9.6	7.2	25.4
211	3.1	1.1	1.7	1.5
212		1.9	1.3	3.0
213	9.2	3.8	4.6	7.5
214	6.1	3.8	6.8	9.0
215	5.1	2.3	2.1	6.0
216	8.2	11.9	4.6	7.5
217	7.1	8.0	1.3	9.0
218	3.1	2.7	2.1	9.0
219	5.1	4.2	.4	7.5
220	32.6	36.0	25.7	50.7
221	11.2	2.7	4.2	9.0
222	13.3	10.3	7.6	13.4
223	17.3	11.1	28.3	32.8
224	28.6	13.0	13.5	23.9
225	6.1	3.4	.8	7.5
226	5.1	6.5	11.0	14.9
227	24.5	13.8	9.3	26.9
228	51.0	12.3	2.1	7.5
229	8.2	6.9	3.0	9.0
230	4.1	4.2	9.7	3.0
231	7.1	4.2	1.3	6.0
232	5.1	1.9	2.1	4.5
233	16.3	8.0	3.4	13.4
234	22.4	14.2	4.2	19.4
235	9.2	1.9	3.8	1.5
236	7.1	3.4	1.7	6.0
237	12.2	4.6	1.7	11.9
238	53.1	56.3	21.9	46.3
239	25.5	28.7	19.0	16.4
240	16.3	3.8	1.3	22.4
241	15.3	11.5	2.5	16.4
242	13.3	7.3	2.1	7.5
243	7.1	6.9	3.0	13.4
244	7.1	4.2	7.6	20.9
245	9.2	3.4	3.8	19.4
246	5.1	2.3		1.5
247	13.3	5.4	6.3	10.4
248	21.4	15.3	17.7	19.4

TABLE B.4 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
249	19.4	7.7	13.5	14.9
250	9.2	3.4	7.6	9.0
251	13.3	8.8	9.3	11.9
252	19.4	22.6	14.8	23.9
253	10.2	7.3	1.7	3.0
254	9.2	2.7	3.0	6.0
255	17.3	18.8	6.3	25.4
256	11.2	4.2	8.4	10.4
257	9.2	5.0	6.3	14.9
258	10.2	5.0	5.9	9.0
259	5.1	2.7	2.5	6.0
260	12.2	7.3	3.0	7.5
261	9.2	6.5	1.7	17.9
262	17.3	11.1	2.1	11.9
263	25.5	16.5	8.9	23.9
265	13.3	18.8	17.3	25.4
266	11.2	4.2	2.1	11.9
267	11.2	3.1	1.3	10.4
268	11.2	6.5	3.8	14.9
269	8.2	4.6	1.7	7.5
270	3.1	1.5	3.0	1.5
271	1.0	2.7	3.0	1.5
272	3.1	3.4	5.1	6.0
273	32.7	14.9	8.0	28.4
274	6.1	2.7		13.4
275	7.1	2.7	.8	6.0
276	11.2	8.8	2.5	10.4
277	16.3	16.1	2.5	32.8
278	3.1	3.1	2.5	3.0
279	7.1	3.1	3.4	6.0
280	14.3	3.1	2.1	25.4
302	1.0	4.6	7.2	4.5
303	5.1	3.8	8.0	6.0
304		1.5	1.3	
305	5.1	6.1	4.2	3.0
306	9.2	7.3	1.3	17.9
307	2.0	1.1	7.6	
308	2.0		11.4	
317	7.1	4.6	4.6	9.0
318	17.3	23.4	23.6	23.9
319	26.5	26.4	37.6	11.9
320	3.1	.8		1.5
321	4.6	7.3	7.2	4.5
322	16.3	23.8	15.2	11.9
323	28.6	11.1	31.2	19.4
324	5.1	10.7	3.8	7.5

TABLE B.4 (Continued)

Item Number	Teachers	Parents	Pupils	School Officials
325	30.6	21.8	8.0	38.8
326	12.2	7.7	8.0	6.0
327	4.1	2.7	6.3	6.0
328	2.0	2.3	1.3	3.0
329	11.2	3.8	2.1	4.5
330	3.1	1.9	.4	3.0

APPENDIX C

SCALED COGNITIONS AND REPORTED TEACHER BEHAVIORS

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

TABLE C.1

ITEMS USED FOR SCALED COGNITION QUESTIONS

Item Number	Form	Item
1	A	Watching pupils during study period
2	A	Supervising pupils in a classroom test
3	A	Singing during a classroom singing period
4	A	Ignoring pupils misbehaving in a classroom
5	A	Keeping pupils quiet in the library
6	A	Speaking out at PTA meeting in the auditorium
7	A	Policing the halls
8	A	Disciplining pupils during basketball games in the gym
9	A	Visiting with other teachers on the playground
10	A	Cooperating with other teachers in school
11	B	Visiting with other teachers during study period
12	B	Watching for cheaters during a classroom test
13	B	Having pupils sing solos during a classroom singing period
14	B	Telling misbehaving pupils in the classroom to stop talking
15	B	Doing own studying and grading in the library
16	B	Attending PTA meetings in the auditorium
17	B	Allowing pupils to explore during experiments in the laboratory
18	B	Kibitzing during basketball game in gym
19	B	Supervising on the playground
20	B	Cooperating with the principal in school
21	C	Reading own books during study period
22	C	Leaving the room during a classroom test
23	C	Grading papers during a classroom singing period
24	C	Threatening pupils misbehaving in the classroom
25	C	Choosing books for pupils in the classroom
26	C	Visiting with parents during PTA meeting in the auditorium
27	C	Being partisan during football game on athletic field
28	C	Doing menial tasks during basketball game in gym
29	C	Disciplining pupils in cafeteria
30	C	Participating in community activities out of school
31	D	Preparing future lessons during reading period
32	D	Leaving the room during a classroom study period
33	D	Having pupils choose songs during a classroom singing period
34	D	Telling pupils' parents about pupils misbehaving in classroom
35	D	Disciplining pupils during reading period in library
36	D	Sitting with other teachers during an assembly in the auditorium
37	D	Attending football games on athletic field
38	D	Participating with pupils in gym
39	D	Grading pupils in school
40	D	Using alcohol out of school
41	E	Preparing future lessons during recess period
42	E	Grading papers during a classroom test
43	E	Punishing pupils misbehaving in the classroom
44	E	Sending pupils misbehaving in the classroom to the principal's office
45	E	Listening and not participating during PTA meeting in the auditorium
46	E	Correcting pupils during an assembly in the auditorium
47	E	Maintaining order during football game on athletic field
48	E	Visiting with other teachers during track meet on athletic field
49	E	Disciplining pupils in school
50	E	Smoking out of school

TABLE C.2

SCALED CONDITIONS AND BEHAVIORS REPORTED BY TEACHERS

Item	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms				T. S.
	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	
1	3.19	4.19	3.43	3.67	3.47	3.90	3.52	3.80	2.07	1.00	1.20	1.13	3.60
2	3.87	4.35	3.86	4.10	3.80	4.20	3.97	4.03	1.40	1.14	1.21	1.13	4.05
3	3.55	3.65	3.32	3.30	3.45	3.75	3.30	3.66	2.26	1.22	2.07	1.15	3.43
4	2.03	2.03	1.76	1.83	2.00	2.30	1.76	1.73	4.20	3.90	4.33	4.60	2.09
5	4.13	4.19	4.20	4.10	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.47	1.41	1.45	1.20	1.17	4.09
6	1.40	2.35	1.76	2.33	2.37	2.33	2.17	2.37	3.97	4.00	4.07	3.67	1.60
7	2.97	3.50	3.07	3.63	2.97	3.37	3.03	3.67	2.66	1.83	2.10	1.33	3.09
8	2.29	2.90	2.39	2.93	2.53	2.03	2.76	2.77	3.13	2.45	2.52	2.20	2.45
9	2.68	2.42	2.55	1.83	2.23	1.87	2.53	1.83	4.33	4.03	2.93	4.60	2.41
10	4.50	4.61	4.34	4.86	4.73	4.63	4.76	4.90	1.00	1.17	1.00	1.00	4.59
11	1.33	1.63	1.97	1.29	1.45	1.43	1.93	1.76	4.72	4.02	4.37	4.46	1.50
12	3.33	4.07	3.63	3.81	3.21	4.00	3.50	3.96	3.38	1.79	1.96	1.60	3.35
13	2.17	2.37	2.06	2.25	2.31	2.75	2.30	2.34	4.45	3.43	4.20	3.23	2.30
14	3.13	4.07	3.39	3.54	3.00	3.50	3.27	3.20	2.79	2.07	2.36	1.96	3.15
15	2.77	2.57	3.09	2.86	3.00	3.10	3.19	3.16	3.21	2.89	3.00	2.36	2.35
16	3.93	4.30	3.63	4.43	3.38	4.71	3.54	4.42	1.90	1.14	2.12	1.12	3.80
17	2.70	2.83	2.59	2.93	2.97	3.07	3.12	2.92	2.69	2.36	2.60	2.16	3.00
18	2.10	2.24	1.91	1.96	2.03	2.07	2.36	2.04	4.43	4.12	4.17	4.04	1.95
19	3.73	4.17	3.59	4.39	3.38	4.25	3.69	4.15	2.10	1.25	1.00	1.15	3.63
20	4.83	4.90	4.75	4.93	4.90	4.86	4.80	4.92	1.45	1.21	1.20	1.15	4.85
21	1.42	1.50	1.33	1.07	1.40	1.20	1.33	1.13	4.71	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.25
22	1.00	1.00	1.17	1.00	1.13	1.13	1.27	1.20	4.86	5.00	5.00	5.00	1.00
23	1.08	1.33	1.17	1.00	1.13	1.20	1.20	1.20	4.93	4.93	5.00	5.00	1.00
24	2.33	2.58	2.33	1.86	1.80	1.93	2.07	1.87	5.00	4.86	4.29	4.43	1.50
25	2.67	2.83	2.73	2.58	2.40	2.80	2.60	2.80	3.86	2.71	3.29	2.43	3.50
26	2.92	3.75	2.67	2.86	2.53	3.33	2.53	3.13	3.57	2.43	3.00	2.85	2.75
27	2.75	3.42	2.58	3.00	2.60	3.13	2.60	3.07	3.43	3.00	3.57	3.15	2.00
28	1.75	2.33	1.83	2.23	1.47	2.13	1.47	2.80	5.00	3.64	4.43	3.29	1.00
29	2.67	2.42	2.67	2.92	2.27	2.53	2.79	2.87	3.57	3.00	3.13	1.57	2.50
30	2.92	3.50	2.75	3.08	3.00	3.73	3.00	3.79	2.85	1.05	2.71	1.92	3.00

Note: Entries in the cells represent numbers and percentages of respondents volunteering the given trait frameworks. Frameworks are ranked in order of percentage usage by Teachers.

TABLE C.3

SCALED CONDITIONS REPORTED BY PARENTS

Item	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO
1	3.56	3.75	3.65	4.29	3.77	3.86	3.57	4.11	1.33	1.34	1.66	1.23
2	3.87	3.95	3.78	4.24	4.07	3.92	3.64	4.06	1.46	1.46	1.90	1.44
3	3.88	3.76	3.57	3.58	3.84	3.75	3.43	3.51	1.47	1.46	1.88	1.35
4	1.72	1.95	1.93	1.67	1.51	1.80	1.79	1.62	4.39	4.29	4.41	4.39
5	4.35	4.49	4.46	4.53	4.56	4.42	4.32	4.62	1.23	1.23	1.29	1.18
6	2.75	2.81	2.54	2.63	3.16	3.00	2.87	2.93	2.52	2.72	3.22	2.79
7	3.64	3.73	3.30	3.88	3.08	3.76	3.57	4.13	1.38	1.40	1.76	1.25
8	2.87	3.05	2.71	3.21	3.11	3.30	3.06	3.50	2.00	2.06	3.11	1.89
9	2.35	2.29	2.74	2.06	2.33	2.11	2.77	2.16	4.04	4.31	3.17	4.13
10	4.69	4.47	4.51	4.79	4.70	4.58	4.49	4.83	1.07	1.08	1.01	1.06
11	1.80	2.04	2.21	1.74	1.93	1.81	2.45	--	4.28	4.24	3.29	4.48
12	3.47	3.76	3.49	4.10	3.53	3.72	3.34	3.80	2.44	2.03	2.34	1.67
13	2.20	2.44	2.25	2.46	2.37	2.63	2.53	2.60	3.96	3.56	3.76	3.67
14	3.43	3.82	3.61	3.71	3.42	3.69	3.43	3.61	2.41	1.83	2.52	2.11
15	3.39	3.65	3.09	3.68	3.39	3.59	3.31	3.70	2.13	1.91	2.75	1.89
16	4.09	4.32	3.56	4.34	3.86	--	3.44	4.33	1.32	1.12	2.30	1.15
17	3.16	3.33	3.09	2.91	3.17	3.18	2.92	3.08	2.01	2.48	2.67	2.28
18	2.00	2.15	1.91	1.79	2.03	1.95	2.03	1.95	4.01	3.80	4.23	4.11
19	4.09	4.01	3.69	4.30	4.24	4.48	3.62	4.33	1.22	1.08	2.01	1.13
20	4.71	4.77	4.61	4.87	4.70	4.71	4.29	4.88	1.13	1.20	1.57	1.06
21	2.54	2.32	2.57	2.10	2.17	2.16	2.56	1.79	4.02	4.16	3.67	4.04
22	1.33	1.47	1.50	1.19	1.37	1.56	1.47	1.19	4.44	4.63	4.56	4.61
23	1.96	2.19	2.27	1.73	1.59	1.87	1.98	1.61	4.33	4.42	4.40	4.20
24	2.49	2.98	2.91	2.67	2.63	2.48	2.67	2.48	3.56	3.86	3.42	3.43
25	3.23	3.26	2.74	3.15	2.98	2.91	2.70	2.98	2.80	3.11	3.67	3.07
26	3.04	3.49	2.77	3.53	3.00	3.36	2.70	3.10	2.35	2.12	3.12	2.14
27	2.98	3.27	2.70	2.83	2.91	3.18	2.81	2.83	2.98	2.85	3.34	2.00
28	2.02	2.39	1.79	2.36	1.77	2.20	1.79	2.31	4.07	3.80	4.10	3.37
29	3.48	3.57	3.30	3.69	3.37	3.07	3.20	3.30	2.41	2.88	2.54	1.86
30	2.84	3.28	2.44	3.10	2.89	3.02	2.67	3.16	1.72	2.12	3.10	1.93

Note: Entries in the cells represent numbers and percentages of respondents volunteering the given trait frameworks. Frameworks are ranked in order of percentage usage by Teachers.

TABLE C.4

SCALED CONDITIONS REPORTED BY PUPILS

Item	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO
1	3.37	3.79	4.05	4.25	3.36	3.96	3.37	4.17	2.49	1.46	1.67	1.44
2	3.18	3.47	3.46	3.33	3.45	3.56	3.32	3.58	2.30	1.96	2.44	2.10
3	3.60	3.33	3.46	3.65	3.68	3.65	3.42	3.75	2.19	2.15	2.13	1.92
4	1.95	1.70	—	1.09	2.33	1.96	2.13	1.96	3.67	3.91	3.72	3.87
5	4.16	4.29	4.27	4.64	4.06	4.26	4.23	4.43	1.80	1.53	1.54	1.30
6	2.61	3.02	2.96	3.02	3.10	3.16	3.33	3.23	2.88	2.73	2.60	2.35
7	3.32	3.52	3.50	3.80	3.15	3.70	3.87	4.06	2.94	2.06	1.67	1.60
8	3.21	3.46	3.41	3.60	3.38	3.53	3.75	3.81	2.78	2.16	2.02	2.21
9	2.67	2.31	2.90	2.33	2.78	2.55	3.02	2.47	3.17	3.53	2.69	3.46
10	4.31	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.43	4.46	4.31	4.56	1.34	1.17	1.25	1.29
11	2.00	2.10	2.33	1.83	1.95	2.11	2.55	1.90	4.26	4.23	3.62	4.31
12	3.68	4.09	3.80	4.26	3.81	4.13	3.97	4.23	2.21	1.72	1.90	1.44
13	1.86	2.40	2.33	2.33	2.15	2.37	2.38	2.66	3.63	3.27	3.29	2.90
14	3.70	3.93	3.61	3.82	3.41	3.73	3.87	3.86	2.98	2.22	2.05	1.90
15	3.38	3.26	3.25	3.49	3.30	3.69	3.56	3.74	2.76	2.40	2.74	2.42
16	4.08	4.37	4.22	4.64	4.26	5.00	4.44	4.62	1.56	1.44	1.49	1.49
17	2.87	3.03	2.89	2.92	3.66	3.25	2.98	3.19	2.04	2.50	2.03	2.64
18	2.33	2.39	2.48	2.77	2.33	2.32	2.51	2.53	3.42	3.58	3.37	3.43
19	3.77	4.04	3.88	4.23	3.64	4.06	4.10	4.37	2.37	1.97	1.83	1.47
20	4.45	4.57	4.41	4.65	4.43	4.62	4.55	4.54	2.12	1.55	1.81	1.70
21	2.92	2.89	2.95	2.90	3.00	3.00	3.11	2.85	3.26	3.19	3.45	3.60
22	1.46	1.49	1.42	1.23	1.86	1.56	1.71	1.66	4.00	4.21	4.14	4.26
23	2.21	2.19	2.28	2.30	2.08	2.05	2.26	2.03	3.59	3.51	3.50	3.62
24	2.68	2.71	2.72	2.58	2.28	2.75	2.45	2.70	3.95	3.72	3.63	3.59
25	3.05	3.16	3.00	3.13	2.95	2.89	2.70	3.00	3.09	2.74	2.42	2.35
26	3.72	3.74	3.32	3.50	3.30	3.35	3.22	3.44	2.75	2.47	2.70	2.60
27	3.13	3.29	2.97	2.63	3.44	2.76	3.15	2.82	2.59	3.14	2.70	2.76
28	2.46	2.43	2.22	2.50	2.38	2.46	2.44	2.41	3.43	3.49	3.42	3.03
29	3.20	3.29	3.26	3.44	2.97	3.74	3.14	3.36	3.57	2.56	3.00	2.65
30	3.39	3.61	3.29	3.62	3.67	3.46	3.59	3.47	2.27	2.53	2.77	2.56

Note: Entries in the cells represent numbers and percentages of respondents volunteering the given trait frameworks. Frameworks are ranked in order of percentage usage by Teachers.

TABLE C.3

SCALED CONDITIONS REPORTED BY SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Item	Expectations				Positive Norms				Negative Norms			
	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO	Own	PG	T	SO
1	3.67	4.59	3.82	4.06	3.59	4.53	3.94	3.76	1.71	1.47	1.47	1.47
2	4.33	4.53	4.29	4.50	4.13	4.82	4.12	4.24	1.24	1.24	1.24	1.24
3	3.50	4.06	3.12	3.44	3.47	4.29	3.29	3.53	1.94	1.47	2.25	1.71
4	1.83	1.35	1.53	2.00	1.82	1.53	1.71	2.12	5.00	4.76	5.00	5.00
5	4.17	4.81	4.47	4.11	4.18	4.71	4.41	4.24	1.24	1.00	1.00	1.24
6	2.22	2.65	1.82	2.17	2.82	2.59	2.00	2.41	3.53	4.76	4.94	4.29
7	3.28	4.24	3.59	3.72	3.24	4.53	3.41	3.65	1.94	1.00	1.94	1.00
8	2.50	3.41	2.18	2.78	2.76	3.24	3.00	3.00	2.65	2.18	2.25	1.94
9	2.28	2.00	2.76	2.11	2.41	1.82	2.94	2.24	4.76	4.94	3.12	4.53
10	4.78	4.76	4.71	4.72	4.88	4.71	4.65	4.76	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
11	1.67	2.50	2.50	1.22	1.35	1.76	2.39	1.50	4.56	4.78	3.44	4.44
12	3.00	4.33	3.25	3.33	2.76	4.18	3.28	3.28	3.06	1.72	2.56	2.33
13	1.94	2.89	2.50	2.11	2.00	3.12	2.17	2.33	3.83	2.61	4.11	4.11
14	2.72	4.00	3.20	2.94	2.71	3.59	2.67	2.83	3.50	2.24	3.44	3.44
15	2.44	3.72	2.90	2.72	2.65	2.76	2.61	2.78	3.44	3.22	4.11	3.22
16	4.22	4.44	3.15	4.44	4.24	4.18	2.94	4.33	1.44	1.78	3.67	1.00
17	3.44	3.22	2.75	3.61	3.65	3.47	3.00	3.50	2.22	1.88	2.33	1.44
18	2.22	2.56	2.50	2.28	1.94	2.35	2.17	1.78	4.11	3.44	3.09	4.33
19	3.83	4.33	3.40	4.39	4.06	4.75	2.94	4.50	2.00	1.35	2.70	1.22
20	4.56	4.44	4.15	4.83	4.76	4.53	4.22	4.94	1.22	1.28	1.44	1.00
21	1.33	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.63	1.38	1.25	5.00	4.83	4.86	4.57
22	1.00	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.50	1.25	1.00	4.57	4.83	4.71	4.57
23	1.00	1.00	1.17	1.00	1.00	1.25	1.00	1.00	4.57	4.83	4.57	4.71
24	1.50	2.83	1.50	1.13	1.25	1.88	1.75	1.25	4.86	3.50	4.86	5.00
25	2.67	3.50	2.50	2.38	2.50	2.25	2.13	2.25	4.57	3.83	4.67	4.67
26	3.67	3.67	2.83	4.07	3.88	3.75	3.25	3.88	1.71	1.83	1.71	1.71
27	2.50	3.50	2.83	2.60	2.88	3.13	3.00	2.88	3.43	2.50	3.43	3.43
28	2.00	2.50	2.50	2.13	2.13	2.25	1.63	1.88	4.57	4.50	4.57	4.00
29	3.17	3.67	3.00	3.13	2.63	3.00	2.88	2.63	2.57	3.50	3.67	3.14
30	3.17	3.67	3.00	3.00	3.38	3.50	2.75	3.13	2.29	1.33	3.71	2.14

Note: Entries in the cells represent numbers and percentages of respondents volunteering the given trait frameworks. Frameworks are ranked in order of percentage usage by Teachers.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

REFERENCES

1. Biddle, B. J., et al. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Vol. A: "Role Theory and the Methods of Role Analysis"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

2. Barker, Roger G., and Wright, Herbert F. Midwest and Its Children. Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1954.

3. Biddle, B. J., and Simpson, Ann. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Vol. C: "A Program for the Processing of Ordinal Data and Computation of Significance for Selected Central Tendency Differences"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

4. Biddle, B. J., et al. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Vol. 1: "Orientation, Methods and Materials"' University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.

5. Schanck, R. L. "A Study of a Community and Its Groups and Institutions Conceived of as Behaviors of Individuals," Psychological Monographs, No. 2, 1932.

6. Biddle, B. J., et al. Studies in the Role of the Public School Teacher. Vol. 2: "General Characteristics of the School Teacher's Role"; University of Missouri: Social Psychology Laboratory, 1961.